REPORT RESUMES

ED 012 864 AC 001 319

CONFERENCE ON THE CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG WORKER (HARRIMAN, MARCH 11-13, 1966).

BY- WESTIN, ALAN F. AND OTHERS

COLUMBIA UNIV., NEW YORK, CTR. FOR RES. AND EDUC.

PUB DATE 66

CONTRACT OEC-6-85-089

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$5.00 125P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CITIZENSHIP, *EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, *PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION, *YOUNG ADULTS, *LABORERS, YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES, COMMUNITY PROGRAMS, CITIZENSHIP RESPONSIBILITY, ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS, LABOR UNIONS, BUSINESS, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS, SOCIAL CHANGE, SOCIAL PROBLEMS, EVALUATION, CIVIL RIGHTS, LABOR EDUCATION, COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY,

FOR THE FIRST TIME, REPRESENTATIVES FROM CORPORATIONS, UNIONS, AND EDUCATION MET TO DISCUSS CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION FOR THE YOUNG WORKER, AT AN ARDEN HOUSE CONFERENCE, WHICH WAS SPONSORED BY THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN AMERICAN LIBERTIES AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. AFTER A DISCUSSION OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN A RAPIDLY CHANGING SOCIETY, EDUCATION PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL SYSTEM, BY CORPORATIONS, AND UNIONS WAS OUTLINED. A MODEL OF A NEW TEACHING METHOD (CASE STUDY) WAS PRESENTED. BUSINESS MEN ARE ATTENTIVE TO PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS AND CORPORATE PHILANTHROPY BUT PROBLEMS IN CORPORATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS REVOLVE AROUND SELF-INTEREST VS CITIZENSHIP RESPONSIBILITY, LIBERTY AMONG EMPLOYEES, AND THE PRESSURES OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS REVOLUTION. IN LABOR UNIONS, THERE IS PRESSURE FOR CONFORMITY, ALSO, AND A WIDE GAP BETWEEN VIEWS OF TOP UNION SPOKESMEN AND THOSE OF LOCAL LEADERS. LABOR EDUCATION, WHICH HAS BEEN IN ESSENCE LEADERSHIP TRAINING TO BUILD UP ORGANIZATIONAL STRENGTH, IS NOW PROVIDING SOME EDUCATION IN THE AREA OF TOTAL SOCIETY, INCLUDING CIVIL RIGHTS. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ISSUES INVOLVED IN AMERICAN LIBERTIES STEM FROM THE SACREDNESS OF HUMAN LIFE AND DEVELOPMENT IN PSYCHOLOGICAL, SOCIAL, AND AUTONOMOUS FREEDOM. THE CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED WITH DISCUSSIONS OF PRESENT TEACHING OF AMERICAN LIBERTIES AND WHAT THE CENTER MIGHT DO TO IMPROVE IT. (EB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED012864

REPORT

on the

CONFERENCE ON THE CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG WORKER

Arden House, Harriman, New York

March 11 - 13, 1966

Sponsored by the

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN AMERICAN LIBERTIES

Columbia University

Under a grant from the Division of Adult and Vocational Research
U.S. Office of Education
Contract # OE 6-85-089

AC001 319

REPORT

on the

CONFERENCE ON THE CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG WORKER

Arden House, Harriman, New York

March 11 - 13, 1966

Sponsored by the

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN AMERICAN LIBERTIES

Columbia University

Under a grant from the Division of Adult and Vocational Research
U.S. Office of Education
Contract # OE 6-85-089

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Background of the Center	1
II.	Background of the Conference	2
III.	List of Participants and Staff	6
IV.	Conference Papers and Commentaries	8
V.	Highlights of Conference Discussion	91
VI.	Appendices	
	A. Official Agenda	109
	B. Supplemental Labor Education Report	115

I. Background of the Center

The Center for Research and Education in American Liberties was created by Columbia University and Teachers College to unite scholarly analysis, educational innovation and civic energy behind basic reform in the teaching of liberty and citizenship in America.

The Center has formulated a four-part program which it will pursue in the coming decade.

First, a group of scholars from Columbia and other universities, specialists in law, the social and behavioral sciences, and the humanities, will meet over the next three years to study and describe the realities of liberty, equality and justice in America in the late 1960's.

They will compare the current situation with American standards in the era of the Founding Fathers and at selected points during the historical development from frontier society to industrial power. Comparisons will be made of American practice with that of other democratic nations, totalitarian societies, and the newly-emerging nations. Finally, the scholars' group will look at events in the coming decade that will have profound effects on American patterns of liberty--developments in technology, urbanization, inter-group relations, cultural trends, and international affairs.

Simultaneously, the facts and ideas developed by the scholars' group will be used by specialists in education and communication to develop new instructional programs for presenting American liberties.

Case studies, discussion materials, films, and fresh social science analyses will be developed, all geared to imaginative new trends in educational theory. The central goal will be to develop in students and adults alike a firm understanding of the American tradition of freedom, a commitment as citizens to use this freedom to advance social progress, and to develop a critical habit of mind in dealing with the problems of choice and balance that our system of freedom presents.

Next, the Center will develop pilot programs for training teachers and adult education leaders in these new ideas and educational approaches. No improvement of instruction can succeed unless hundreds of thousands of teachers are brought into institutes and courses which train them in the use of this material.

Finally, the Center's Board of Governors, a group of outstanding civic leaders from the fields of business, labor, government, education, law, and religion--will play an important role in the innovation of the program. An Executive Committee of this Board is the policy making organ of the Center, subject to the general supervision of the Administration and Trustees of Columbia University and Teachers College. These men and women will participate actively in the discussion of what American liberties mean today, how to present these more effectively in education, and, most important, how to support the introduction of fresh materials and exciting teaching into the schools and adult education.

II. Background of the Conference

Much of the citizenship education today consists of exhorting people to vote or to "get active" in community affairs. Public school civics courses generally present simplified versions of "how a bill is passed" and talk about the "obligations of a good citizen" in a context of general acceptance of the idea that all Americans want to be "good citizens." Civic, business and labor union public affairs courses tend to concentrate on "getting out the vote" or "how to get into local politics."

This approach seems to have an appeal for those who do identify with the system, who see the system as meeting their needs, and who see participation as a means of insuring that their needs go on being met. But those who do not participate are those who feel shut out of the system--the poor, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and many white workers on lower income and education levels. To them the appeals of modern citizenship education are meaningless. Exhortation and middle-class oriented civics classes have not attracted them into the system as voters or as joiners of groups. Young people also tend to remain outside active political society--only about half the newly eligible voters actually vote in presidential elections; and young people from working class backgrounds are as immune to middle class civic platitudes as are youths from Negro ghettos or migrant camps.

Even within the political community of the sixty million who do vote, we find little knowledge of issues and little participation beyond voting itself. As for "getting active," careful studies of who joins voluntary groups show that the great majority of Americans do not belong to any voluntary associations at all. A recent study shows that two-thirds of American adults belong to no organization when union membership is excluded, and that one-half the families in the United States have no one in them who belongs to any sort of club, lodge, fraternal order or union.

The millions of new citizens who are entering our political system have a bitter awareness that their parents and grandparents have not received equal opportunity or dignity from the American system. And, facing the uncertainties of automation, inadequate housing and schooling and many continuing pressures of discrimination, these young people are capable of concluding that the American system is still organized against them, that the promises of a better life are false. Those who do not participate as citizens may well decide, in wild despair, to pull the system down, as the Watts riot has come to symbolize.

Obviously, no program of citizenship education will have an impact if opportunity and dignity for the new groups entering the citizenry are not forthcoming in time. But even if these goals are met, the older notion of citizenship education--of teaching the value of law and order, genteel protest, and middle class civic activity--will not reach the southern Negro child nor the northern laborer's son nor any other child who believes that "law," "courts," "political parties" and "fancy uptown clubs" are all instruments for keeping him "in his place."

What must be done for these new citizens is what we have tried to do (but have also done badly) for middle and upper class groups--teach about liberty and citizenship in terms of the personal liberty issues that touch their own lives and then build from these to the larger issues of public citizenship and civic participation. A sound concept of citizenship would focus on three elements: getting people to identify with "the system" and to feel that it provides an opportunity for them to satisfy their material and psychological needs; attracting people to the discussion of public issues, which requires starting them on the controversial issues which they know to affect their own lives; and leading them to participate in small-group civic activities, preferably on the neighborhood level, that relate directly to those issues in their own community, whether urban slum or suburban village.

The type of citizenship education about American liberties we are developing will deal with values--it has to if it is not to be so meaningless or so bland that it fails to stir anyone to thought, self-examination and action. But it will teach values by emphasizing the process of free inquiry, the respect for difference and dissent, the rational analysis of issues, the continued vitality of classic constitutional ideals, and the hard job of applying ideals in practice.

In order to develop such education, it is of course necessary to have an extremely clear idea of the realistic possibilities for reaching those whom we wish to teach, and for eliciting the cooperation of those who control educational programs. We must learn precisely what is being taught now, and how and where it is being taught, so that ways of introducing new approaches, new concepts and new information can be realistically formulated.

The Arden House Conference was designed to investigate the educational opportunities now available to those who enter our political system as young workers--of whatever race or ethnic background--those who receive their education from public schools, vocational and technical schools, labor unions, and corporations. Thus, the participants were deliberately selected to obtain as wide a view as possible of the process of citizenship education for young workers. It became increasingly evident during the discussions that not only was this the first time that corporation, union, and education leaders had sat down together to discuss this question but that this kind of interaction is vital for meaningful reform and effective implementation of that reform.

III. CONFERENCE STAFF

Professor Alan F. Westin, Director
Center for Research & Education in American Liberties

Mrs. Minna Post Peyser, Associate Director
Center for Research & Education in American Liberties

Mr. Ray Smith, Consultant
Social Studies Teacher
Hastings High School

Mrs. Heather Feldman, Administrative Assistant
Center for Research & Education in American Liberties

Mrs. Cynthia Lewis, Research Director
Center for Research & Education in American Liberties

Mrs. Judith Marine, Research Assistant
Center for Research & Education in American Liberties

* * * * *

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Mr. William Abbott
Education Director
United Rubber Workers of America

Mr. Richard A. Armstrong
Executive Director
Effective Citizens Organization

Dr. Walter M. Arnold
Assistant Commissioner for Vocational & Technical Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Education

Mr. Lane C. Ash
Director, Program Services
Vocational and Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education

Professor Christian Bay
Political Science Department
Stanford University

Professor Ivar E. Berg, Jr.
Associate Professor of Business Administration
Columbia University

Mr. Steve Betuker
Public Affairs Representative
Republic Steel Corporation

Dr. David Bushnell
Director, Division of Adult & Vocational Research
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Leroy A. Cornelsen
Assistant to the Director
Vocational and Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Martin Deutsch, Director
Institute for Developmental Studies
Department of Psychiatry
New York Medical College

Dr. Alva R. Dittrick
Deputy Superintendent
Cleveland Public Schools

Mr. Thomas J. Diviney
Assistant Vice President, Division of Public Affairs Research
National Industrial Conference Board

Dean Rupert Evans
College of Education
University of Illinois

Mr. Harry Fleischman
Race Relations Coordinator
American Jewish Committee

Mr. James J. Maher
Vice President in Charge of Public Affairs
Chase Manhattan Bank

Mr. Reubin Maloff
Chairman, Fashion Trades High School
Academic Subjects Department
High School of Fashion Industries

Miss Magdalena Miranda
Division of Community Planning and Service
Lincoln Hospital Community Health Services

Mr. Richard Nelson
Director of Public Relations
The Inland Steel Company

Mr. Paul Noble, President
Printing Institute of Metropolitan New York

Dr. Samuel D. Proctor
Executive Office of the President
Office of Economic Opportunity

Mr. Arthur Reese
Executive Director
American Federation of Teachers

Professor Martin Rein
Bryn Mawr College

Mrs. Harriett Reynolds
Assistant Director of Education
National Urban League

Mr. Ormsbee Robinson
Director of Educational Affairs
International Business Machines Corporation

Professor Jerry M. Rosenberg
Professor of Education
Teachers College

Dr. Alice Y. Scates, Director
Human Resources Branch
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Education

Mr. Carl Schlesinger
Executive Secretary
Treasurer of the Printing Utility Branch of the N.Y. Typographical Union Local #6

Mr. Brendon Sexton, Director
Leadership Studies Center
United Auto Workers of America

Dr. A. Webster Tenny
Organizational Relations Education
U.S. Office of Education

Mr. Harry Van Arsdale, Jr.
President, New York City Central Labor Council
AFL-CIO

Mr. Thomas A. Van Sant
Assistant Superintendent
Bureau of Community Education

Dean Clarence Walton
School of General Studies
Columbia University

Professor Aaron W. Warner
Professor of Economics
Columbia University

Professor Richard F. W. Whittemore
Associate Professor of History
Teachers College

Senator Ralph M. Yarborough
United States Senate

IV. Conference Papers and Commentaries

Prior to the Conference, many of the papers were distributed to the participants. The writers then commented briefly on their papers during the sessions, and other panel members commented on the papers presented.

The conference officially convened on Friday, March 11, at 8:30 p.m., at which time Mrs. Minna Post Peyser, Associate Director of the Center, welcomed participants. After this welcome, United States Senator Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas addressed the group on "Politics, Citizenship Education, and Liberty."

POLITICS, CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND LIBERTY

Senator Ralph W. Yarborough

If this meeting had taken place ten years ago, I could have come before you then, and begun by saying that the United States of America is the most complex society the world has ever known. Certainly none of you would have questioned the statement.

And yet to look back now even so short a way--back to the end of the first term of President Eisenhower, when the transistor radio had just begun to appear, when freedom rides and sit-ins were unknown, and when there were more American civilians than military in Vietnam--is to see that our society is characterized no more by complexity than by fantastic change.

In America, a group of prominent scientists, businessmen and labor leaders recently called it revolutionary change, so rapidly do new complexities follow one upon another--they wrote of the "Triple Revolution" in automation, weaponry and civil rights.

Living in Washington, I'm especially sensitive to one aspect of this revolution in technology--the proliferation of electronic listening devices. Your telephone gets bugged with so many devices that sometimes you get such a drag on it you can hardly hear over the line. It makes me think we should upgrade 1984 to 1974.

I've become very much aware of the great explosion of knowledge that we face today, as I've listened to testimony for 8 years on the Senate Subcommittee on Education. Recently one of the top executives of Encyclopaedia Britannica was testifying before us, and he said that the explosion of learning was so fast that in rewriting the Encyclopaedia Britannica, they had to change 10 million of the 38 million words. He said that if he had to put a date on the beginning of this explosion in learning, he would choose 1958, with the National Defense Education Act.

We had, by September of last year, 800,000 college students educated--or partially helped--under the NDEA, with $619 million in loans. The teacher institutes, the placing of foreign language laboratories in high schools, the building of science laboratories in the schools--all these things which upgrade teaching and the manner of teaching have had revolutionary effects in high schools.

At the time that the act was passed there were just over 1600 colleges in the United States. Now there are over 2100. Of course there are many reasons for an increase in colleges, but one reason is the availability of funds for student loans. Last year out of the 2100, there were 1600 with student loan funds. We had as many colleges with loan funds in 1965 as existed in all of the U.S. in 1958, and in 1958 there were only 100 colleges with loan funds. That helps explain why there are 5,900,000 students registered in colleges in America now.

We've now passed a cold war GI Bill, which ties in with the Korean Bill. Of the first 2,500,000 veterans discharged from the cold war, over 600,000 had not finished high school at the time they entered the armed services. I think we get more out of the GI Bill dollar for dollar because when these men come back after they've been in foxholes for 2 years, they have a great deal of drive and will to learn.

Of the men under the World War II GI Bill and the Korean War Bill, there were hundreds of thousands who were the first member of their family--going back generations--to see the inside of a college. Since they went to college, now their brothers and sisters, nieces and nephews are knocking at college doors.

As a Texan from a small rural community of about 600 people, an area impoverished since the Civil War and Reconstruction, I know first-hand the impact of this education explosion. When my older brother graduated from the University of Texas, he was the only person in that town with a college degree. Last summer I went to speak at the Lions' Club in a rural town of 500 in that same area. Of 26 people at the meeting, 23 had college degrees, although most of them were rice growers.

We all find it very difficult to keep up with such changes--in education, technology, or human rights. We share the very human tendency to want to keep things the same, to find some things in our lives which sit still long enough for us to understand them and feel at home with them.

But the world won't let us do that these days. As Americans there are new things for us to understand every day--and this imposes a terrible burden on any citizen who is trying to understand his society and the political choices he must make. We in Congress feel the impact of this growing complexity very strongly. It is more difficult for us to keep informed so that we can serve intelligently on committees and cast a reasonably intelligent vote.

Young people, now entering adulthood, have no nostalgia for a world more stable and secure than this one--they have never known one. Yet they too search for something which will sit still long enough for them to understand it. We who are older at least have--or can try to have--some perspective about the current flux in our society. But the young workers of today have only today's world--a world of mass technology, mass destruction and mass movements--in which to find their place.

They are your students, your members, your employees, today and tomorrow. In the next 10 years there will be 30 million of them entering the job market. They are your vital concern as they are mine. What will they need in order to live full productive lives as citizens--and as individual human beings--and what can we do to help them?

We don't need any "Triple Revolution" to tell us that what young people need most in their lives beyond basic food and shelter is meaning. For decades, men and women trying to understand the young have found their subjects searching for something which will give meaning to their lives, something on which they can build their lives. This is not new.

What is new is that there is little in the lives of today's young people which is stable, which is sure, which they know will go on being the same. They don't grow up in the houses their fathers grew up in. They don't expect to hold the jobs their fathers held. Many of them fear that they will find no jobs at all. And in a society which continues to measure a man's worth by the job he holds, that is a terrible thing to fear.

Only recently, too--recently enough so that we can feel shame that for so long we shut it from our contemplations--academic and political men alike have discovered whole cultures in which stability and sameness and sureness have long been more phantom than real. The world of the Negro, the world of the Puerto Rican, the world of the Mexican-American, the world of the urban poor. In these worlds, our school books, our mass media, our dreams, our values are readily available--but never our prosperity and certainly not most of our jobs.

Today's young people leaving high schools and vocational schools to look for a job may not know of or care about the protests, the intellectualized complaints of some of today's college youth. The young worker, Negro or white, may never think or talk of "automation" or the "population explosion" or the "revolution in human rights" or the "flux and mobility of modern society "

But he does know that he has to have skills to get a job because machines are doing the work he might have done 20 years ago. He does know that there are lots and lots of other guys looking for jobs, trying to get skills, too. He does know that there are going to be more chances for Negroes to get jobs. The white youth may fear this, simply because he doesn't know what it means for him and he's already afraid there won't be enough jobs to go around. The Negro youth may fear that these promises of skills and jobs may, like so many other promises to him, prove hollow.

The young worker knows, too, that none of his friends seem very sure of what's going to happen to them either. He knows that adults are always eager to give him advice, but many adults seem confused themselves, or they disagree with each other, or what they have to say has little to do with what bothers him. Change comes so quickly today that it is more difficult than ever for the father to talk to the son. Today's young people don't have to be college radicals to be convinced that they can't trust anyone over 30.

You can hardly turn on a radio today without being blasted by rock 'n roll or "folk rock." But did you ever take a minute to listen to the words of some of those songs that teen-agers all over the country are buying by the millions? I was startled when I discovered that these songs are mostly not about "true love" but about bewilderment, lack of values, about--if you will-alienation.

We talk about and sometimes deplore the fact that rock 'n roll is so pervasive--but do we stop and think what that means? It means that millions of teenagers, from New York ghettos to Georgia farms to Los Angeles suburbs to elm-shaded streets in Topeka are listening to the same songs. And what they hear are the Beatles singing about a fellow who "Doesn't have a point of view, don't know where he's going to, isn't he a bit like you...and me?" or a group called The Vogues lamenting that:

I just don't know why
I bother to try
When nobody gives a hang
If I live or die --

Where's the good life they said I could find?
Where's the magic to make all my daydreams
come true?

Do you have any doubt whom the "they" refers to?

What we're faced with is the challenge of helping these young people to find the good life we're promising them. And we must remember that the young worker who "don't know where he's going to" isn't simply looking for a job so that he can eat. He's looking for dignity, for self-respect. He's looking for something he can do which other men will consider useful. He's looking for some place to live and work where he's needed and wanted--where it will matter to other people whether he lives or dies. He fears, as many of us fear, the future in a society in which people stand behind closed windows and watch a woman die.

We worry about a society of citizens who "don't want to get involved." But what are we doing--what can we do--to help new generations of citizens to find themselves in this society, and in fact to become the citizens who will build a stronger, "greater" society tomorrow, who will be involved because they know the society belongs to them?

The War on Poverty which we are all fighting is an attempt to give the help that some of our young people so drastically need. As co-author of that bill, I am disappointed that many more thousands of people have not been reached, but we have had problems in getting enough money for all the projects in the Poverty Program because of the expansion of the war in Vietnam. We know the Program is good for those who do come under it. We are trying to give these young people--and some older people, too--a chance to become productive citizens.

I mean "we" in the fullest sense, for we as legislators may pass the law and appropriate the money, but it is you--educators, businessmen, labor leaders--who must act with us to create dynamic, exciting programs which will reach out and pull into the mainstream of economic and social life the people trapped by poverty, prejudice and purposelessness.

Ours is a society surging with activity. And in the midst of such activity, to be unemployed is to be guilty. To be employed, to be useful is to have dignity and self-respect. Such dignity is the minimum upon which to build a meaningful life.

In the Poverty Program we are teaching young men and women skills they need to find jobs, and we are also helping them learn, along the way, how to work with other people, deal with other people, talk to other people. In Job Corps centers youngsters can learn a great deal about being auto mechanics or electronics repairmen or bakers. They can also learn at least a little about being citizens. Job Corps administrators have described new arrivals as "sullen, suspicious and aggressive...out to prove how tough they are" or "just plain scared." More than two thirds stay in the program, and those who stay gain in confidence, make friends and learn to solve their own discipline problems in group sessions.

With a growing shortage of skilled and semi-skilled workers, and with the services sector of the economy expanding fast, the trained youngsters turned out by the Job Corps and by related programs which upgrade workers for more highly skilled jobs can obviously fill a vital need in the society.

Thousands of other young workers will find jobs within the Poverty Program as aides to social workers, teachers and youth workers involved in community action programs.

The young people in these programs are being given the help they seek. Although there are no long-range results as yet, what we have seen happen is encouraging. Of the young men and women who graduated from urban and conservation centers in 1965, 35% were drafted or enlisted in the service, and 18% returned to school. The rest all found jobs, and a January survey indicated that about 90% of them are still employed. But there were only 700 graduates in all. We need to reach many more young people if we are to have any real effect on the society as a whole.

Another project, Head Start, has been tremendously successful in giving children from underprivileged backgrounds the language facility which other children have when they start school. Without this language ability, children will never catch up educationally. I think a better title for the program would be Project Even Start--since what it does is give underprivileged children a more even chance in life.

I would also like to mention a Poverty Program literacy project in Austin, Texas, for adults. We expected that about 500 would register, but 5200 showed up to register. The public school teachers who volunteered to teach the classes said they had never had students so diligent as these 40 & 50 year old men and women, whites, Negroes, and Mexican-Spanish Americans.

Then the federal funds were cut off, because of cuts in the Poverty Program budget. The teachers said they could easily get 10,000 or 15,000 registrants, if the funds were available.

Out of that county of over a million and a half, there are 160,000 adults unable to read a report or a training manual, or write a letter. The general attitude has been that these people don't want to work, don't want to study.

But when the money ran out, many of the students wrote me laborious long hand letters asking that the school please be kept open. We need to do a great deal more both for the underprivileged youth and for the older people who never had an Even Start.

But even if we could bring them all to the level of skill, education and confidence equal to those workers who already have what's needed to compete successfully for jobs in today's world--would that be enough?

Are we doing enough today for those young workers-to-be who are not considered "under-privileged"? For certainly, fear, bewilderment and rootlessness are not confined to Negro or Puerto Rican or Mexican-American youth. People with jobs and cars and apartments "don't want to get involved." Workers of all ages and backgrounds fear unemployment--and one thing many of them fear is automation.

They may know the scare stories of automation--examples like that of an automated bakery in which the grain is delivered to the silo and is not touched by human hands until it emerges as bread from the oven.

They may know about some of the effects of automation from their own experience or from members of their families if they work in the telephone industry or on the railroads, in coal-mining or petroleum-refining, or in shipping or printing.

They may simply be New Yorkers--who remember doing for 116 days without the Times--or more likely the Daily News--despite the fact that wages were not in dispute between the newspaper publishers and the typographers. Only the problems of automation were at issue.

And those workers who do not already fear automation are learning to do so. At a recent conference of union officials in California on problems of automation, a bartenders' representative concluded thankfully that at least they'll never automate the bartender.

But, someone exclaimed, they already have--there's an automatic dispenser, and it even looks sympathetic!

A fight against automation is obviously a losing battle. Unions and corporations are, rather, trying to find ways to adjust to it--often by providing for current employees until they die or retire, or by finding them other jobs. It's also true that automation creates jobs in some industries, and there is the increasing expansion of the service industries.

Nonetheless, we face the possibility of a future in which it simply won't be necessary for everyone to work in order to have a healthy economy, or at least workers won't need to work 40 hours a week. Indeed, it might not be possible for everyone who wants to work to spend even 35 hours a week on the job, and we will probably be able, if we so desire, to guarantee everyone the right to an adequate income, work or no work.

But to the extent that we retain the values of today, which tie a man's dignity and self-respect to his holding of a "useful" job, how can we face a society of reduced work-time? If today's young workers follow the example of their elders and take their new-won jobs as the focal points of their lives, what will happen to their lives if their job-time is reduced to half?

The quality of life in the American society of the future will be largely determined by how well this country walks what Adlai Stevenson called "the narrow and nervous border between automation's promise of either plenty or misery." We may wonder further whether we will succeed in producing plenty--material plenty--for all, while leaving millions in the barrenness of boredom and apathy.

We must concern ourselves not only with providing young workers with skills and perhaps a "little training for citizenship." We must find ways to combat their feelings of powerlessness and helplessness toward the forces which shape their lives--government and the groups which have a say in government. The young worker today may find a job and self-respect, but still feel helpless and "managed," still feel that he doesn't understand the world he lives in, that there's nothing he can do to affect the way things happen. Change is something that happens to him, not something he brings about.

The estrangement of American youth from our society becomes a serious factor affecting the very stability of our way of life. Our progress as a nation will be deterred by protracted disruptions, violence and demoralized spirit which we are witnessing now. This will mount unless valid ways are devised to bring those who feel they are outside the system into believing that it is theirs too. The ways and means of doing this deserve the highest attention of those who think of themselves as good citizens in terms that are real today.

How we meet the legitimate yearnings of our young people to be incorporated in life, bears not only on our internal strength but on our leadership position in the world. It's not an American youth problem but a world youth problem. Recently The New York Times reported the complaint of young Russians that Communist ideology is "no longer being presented in terms that the younger generation can believe." Similarly we read of unrest, protest, upheaval among the young people in England, France, West Germany, and Italy. As the aristocratic controls in their countries break down, and technology, prosperity and communication spread, these societies are becoming more egalitarian. They too are faced with broadening the power base and letting in the new groups and the young groups. They too are challenged to find new ways of maintaining the allegiance of young people. Our openness as a society, our inventiveness and our real concern for the future of our youth as we meet this challenge can and will be communicated to the rest of the world. Just as the music of despair is shared by young people of the world today, songs of faith can also come into vogue and unite the young generations.

All of us here are concerned in one way or another with citizenship education. Some of you are involved in the formal teaching of citizenship and political skills. Some of you are involved in organizing people to register and vote.

Wide-spread voting and political contributions are certainly crucial for democracy. The abolishment of the poll tax has presented those of us in Texas, and other areas of the South, with a chance to register thousands of new voters and give a political voice to many people previously excluded. The Texas AFL-CIO is working hard to reach these potential voters.

But simply casting a vote or giving a dollar doesn't mean that a young man understands the political choice he has made, or that he attaches very much value to his action. Many, many people in America do not really believe that it "matters" whether they vote or not. And they do not believe that it's "worth their time" to get involved in political activities.

The young show even less interest in politics than their elders. Yet there is evidence that they do not enjoy feeling powerless and confused. Much less are they likely to enjoy life in a future society in which mass leisure is merely mass idleness.

If the young workers of tomorrow do not consider political action any more meaningful or useful than do the youth of today, it won't matter how much leisure they have--they still won't spend it in seeking better schools or better parks or better governors.

If we want to combat their confusion, boredom and apathy, and make sure that our society will have active, purposeful and self-respecting citizens eager to deal with the myriad of problems we face and still face, what we need is to declare a war on poverty of the mind.

Educators and other concerned citizens are already talking about the new forms of education which we'll need to prepare people to live in an automated society. One of the most valuable things we can try to teach the young worker is a concern for what happens in his community, his state, his nation, and a knowledge of what he can do.

It is here that we can make our commitment of civil liberties felt. A knowledge of his rights as a citizen, as a political actor, as an individual whose dignity is protected by law can significantly help a man to feel the legitimacy and the importance of acting.

Knowledge about the current issues in society--the great struggles going on now that shape the meaning of liberty for individual people and large groups can help the young worker take part in politics. He will look at candidates for the position they take on specific issues--not an uninformed vote for the good guy or against the bad guy.

Knowledge of political process and institutions--how you use your power in a democratic society to try to get what you want from City Hall to Washington, D.C.--is what education must teach young people. And most of all, education must convey, intentionally and subtly, that society really means that it wants them and needs them to take part in shaping the future.

This is a great challenge for all of us. Since coming to the Senate in 1958, I have worked diligently for educational measures which I felt were urgently needed if we are to keep pace with the rapidly changing nature of our society. I am honored to serve on the Board of Governors of this Center, for I believe that the Center fills a great need in America. In this time of great ferment in education, this Center can play a vital role in bringing to young people a full and dynamic sense of what civil liberties mean for the citizen in a democratic society.

By examining the heritage of our American liberties, placing them in the proper perspective within our modern society, and, most importantly, by translating these findings into action, the Center will contribute greatly to keeping this country soundly on the foundations upon which it was created.

The Center has conceived its leadership role in dimensions basic enough, yet broad enough to deliver a sizable improvement. No educational reform can be sure at the outset that it will achieve its goal. But to create one that touches the vital nerve of our free society would, by the dictates of reality, require the ingredients which the Center has thoughtfully incorporated into its design and the staging of its program.

Distinguished scholarship, the application of general advances in educational research and development, and in educational technology to this particular area, the support of a wide spectrum of national leadership, and the concentration on effective teaching--not current development alone--are valid components of a Center which means to do business in the real world of American education today.

And most notable is its recognition that this educational improvement is not for school children only as preparation for the future, but is for adults, of all ages, who mean to take part in our society, changing rapidly as it is.

The education we received on the Bill of Rights and our constitutional liberties--10 years ago--40 years ago--just isn't good enough to help us deal with the issues that are all around us. Adults need education to make sense of today's world. Whether we receive it from public agencies or such private groups as corporations, unions, churches, veterans', women's or civic groups, we need a perspective that lets us understand what is going on in relation to the values and the traditions that we cherish.

I am greatly encouraged to see people here from corporations and unions, as well as from the schools and the government. For it will take the cooperation of all these groups, using imagination and a lot of hard-thinking and hard work to help today's Americans find the self-respect and sense of accomplishment which comes only from living in a world you know you helped to create.

We must give them the basis of this education in the schools, but we can't stop there. There must be further programs for them as they begin to work and live on their own. The future promises to give them the time for learning and for action--the chance to be true citizens. It is up to us to meet the great challenge of preparing them realistically to take advantage of that chance.

Walter Lippman wrote, in 1960, "America is a country and nation, great and prosperous and strong, but America is more than a country. It is a hope, a dream, a vision and an ideal, not only of the world that is but of the world that is to be."

If we are to move toward that "world that is to be," it's well to remember, as President Kennedy said in his Inaugural Address, how difficult this struggle will be, how long we will have to fight against the common enemies of man--tyranny, disease and war itself.

Yet, he continued: "I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it. And the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

I congratulate you on your Center and its goals, for surely the young Americans who take up this difficult struggle will have to have an understanding of the meaning of American citizenship and American liberties which will spur their energy and inspire their devotion.

* * *

Professor Alan F. Westin, Director of the Center, then addressed the meeting on "Citizenship Education in a Changing Society."

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

Professor Alan F. Westin

As I listened to Senator Yarborough speak about the enormous social change that has taken place in the United States in the past decade, I was struck by the fact that this is exactly the theme of our Center, that the educated citizen's understanding of liberty today requires his comprehending the ways in which our American constitutional system has been affected by contemporary social change. In the past decade, constitutional liberty in American society has undergone a series of powerful changes. There are new patterns of work, communication, and leisure in the United States; new relationships between Protestant and Catholic, Gentile and Jew, Negro and white; new patterns of residence and community life; new methods of social and group protest against injustice; new claims of "rights" by members of large organizations, from corporations and labor unions to university students; new techniques of physical, psychological, and data surveillance over personal life; and a new international setting to the cold war with new implications for the exercise of American liberties. For example, enormous changes are taking place in technology. To give just one example, our basic patterns of liberty are being changed by the spread of surveillance technology, not just physical surveillance by listening and watching devices, but also revolutions in psychological surveillance and data surveillance. Through the growth in personal data collection and computer processing, authorities are developing the power to reconstruct man's daily documentary footprints. This capacity could alter one of the great balances of liberty in our history--the incapacity of government and large institutions to keep track of all the significant things that individuals do.

There are also major changes in American institutional life. Take the Berkeley demonstrations. Students who feel that they've made it to the "heaven" of university life have found that "heaven" is a very over-organized and under-participated kind of place. As they get the IBM cards which allow them to be processed through the system with little contact on a personal level, as they enter classes that have 500, 1000, 1500 students, as they watch television monitors which supposedly make a professor a living thing in five or ten classrooms at once--they wonder what kind of a world they are going into and what kind of role they will play.

We, at the Center, have also been struck by some of the major changes that are taking place in the relationships of individuals to the groups they belong to after they leave school. For example, what does it mean to a member of a corporation today--in the management, professional, scientific, or technological ranks? How do people regard their places in labor unions--their sense of identification with, or alienation from, the leadership of their union?

These are the problems we recognize as the living concerns people are facing today, as they try to deal with the inheritance of our constitutional system--the system of legal rights and the relationships, and the informal processes of group action by which we make those rights and relationships work in our communities. The time has come, we think, to try to link this kind of thinking about change and the constitutional system (which is part of the exciting inquiry of the law school world, the university world, the social sciences) to what young people learn in school and adults in the community after school. This must get out of the educational forums faster than the 20 or 30 years that it usually takes for new knowledge and new ideas to get to people in school and those who have left the schools.

We plan to accomplish this in a four-fold process. First, there will be examination of leading scholars in law and the social sciences of the conditions of social change laid alongside the basic principles and processes in the American constitutional system. Second, we will attempt to develop new educational systems to make the scholarship meaningful to students--films, role playing, games, simulation, programmed learning and other experiments with student or adult learners--to bring a new level of vitality into the students' inquiry about liberty, civil rights and the constitutional system.

Third, we will take the scholarship and new instructional methods and carry these to teachers, drawing on the related innovations in education that have taken place in math and science in the past decade. Only if tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands of teachers are trained for these new concepts and techniques, as well as large numbers of education directors from the private group sector, can there be major change in the educational system. No matter how excellent the descriptions of the new realities and the excellent new case books and films developed, if these are placed in the hands of teachers who are not concerned with the problem and trained to use the new methods of teaching liberty, this reform will simply wither and die, as so many educational reforms have in the past. It certainly won't make any difference in the classrooms or in the meeting rooms of the adult education courses where it ought to have impact.

Fourth, and finally, we believe that this kind of educational reform can only take place if there is a powerful sponsoring group of leaders from the private and public sectors of our society, who would vouch for the importance of this enterprise and give it protection against those critics whose major complaint would be that it is different, that it is change, that it is not the way we did it 20 years ago. It is for this purpose that we have brought together a Board of Governors from the worlds of business, labor, education, government, religion, and the arts.

I have gone over this four point program quickly as an introduction to our focus at this conference--the young worker. In many ways, this may be the most difficult area facing our Center. Innovation in the school systems is a rather regular thing, since society is used to updating ideas and devising new curriculum approaches there. As for educational change in the civic group sector, this also is a system that has a regular basis and a willing constituency. Churches have programs on public affairs, civic rights and liberties. Many women's clubs and veterans groups, for example, have programs in these areas, and their members are usually well motivated to be concerned with such issues.

On the other hand, when we are dealing with the young worker whom we have been defining as especially those just coming into the work force at ages 17-20, we can't have as our image the middle-class, "we've already made it" group that has been in the past, the object of most public school or civic group educational reform. Rather, we are dealing with a group that is coming into a social system to which it is not at all sure it has a loyalty. Thus, I'd like to start off by discussing the real problems involved in this enterprise.

Let me state the premises with which I start. First, I assume that the American constitutional system is worth saving--that our ideals of liberty, equality, and justice still have powerful meaning and merit, and provide a fundamental feature of democratic society. Freedom of speech, press, religion, and association remain the means by which dissent and protest are guaranteed in our system, and the rights to dissent and protest remain the best assurance of continued social, economic, and political progress. We still believe in due process in every forum--whether for a baseball player protesting against the umpire, a minister facing discipline for uttering heretical ideas, a government employee who protests about loyalty-security procedures, a university student or professor discontented with an administrative action concerning his status, a labor union member opposing an action taken by the union leadership, or a junior executive complaining about censure by his superiors for "unwise" political activity. The essence of due process--rules stated in advance, the right to a fair hearing, and an impartial appeal--remain basic ingredients of our ideal of justice, and are even more vital today in the setting of large-organization life in industrial societies.

The continued vitality of our ideal of equality is a good deal easier to defend in 1966 than it would have been if this conference were being held in 1956. We accept openly now the fact that the United States has had two sets of laws on equality from colonial days to our times--one for the white and one for the black. Now, we are struggling to make one law for white and black alike, to carry forward, at a rapid pace, the achievement of full equality for all persons regardless of race, creed, color, or nationality, etc. Thus, the ideal of equality has a meaning today that makes it more acceptable than when it was a reality only for different segments of the white population.

Beyond these three specific ideals of liberty, equality, and justice lies the American constitutional system as a basic mechanism. The late Justice Robert H. Jackson put this well when he said:

> Liberty is not the mere absence of restraint; it is not a spontaneous product of majority rule; it is not achieved merely by lifting underprivileged classes to power; nor is it an inevitable by-product of technological expansion. It is achieved only by a rule of law, by rationally and dispassionately devising rules which limit the majority's control over the individual and the minority.

Believing this, our Center takes the concepts of liberty, equality, and justice and the concepts of social change under a rule of law as the heart of the American democratic system, worth saving and extending in the nuclear age.

My second premise is that American society will still not be worth saving unless we can offer real opportunity and dignity to those whose allegiance we want to win. Constitutional rights are a means, not an end, a means toward achieving the good life. Unless we provide jobs, housing, schools, and the possibility for stable family life, talk about civil rights and civil liberties will have no meaning. At the same time, how can we talk about justice and the rule of law to people who do not feel that the legal system is as open to them as it is to someone who can afford high-priced legal talent? Or to people who believe that police, courts, even prisoners are not treating them with the same impartiality as others of different economic, racial, or religious status?

Furthermore, we cannot take the loyalty and allegiance of today's youngsters for granted, as we were able to do throughout our history. During the 18th, 19th and early 20th century, the U.S. operated two social systems. On the one hand, a number of groups were excluded from effective participation in political affairs because they were not accepted as equals. We kept racial minorities, and particularly American Negroes out of the system; they did not enjoy rights or participate in the system but they were controlled by force and legal coercion; only for this reason did the system never have to worry about their loyalty. Such racial minorities were kept from voting by legal and social rules that separated them from whites in education, housing, public accommodation, and employment. In addition, we kept the poor out of the system, regardless of race, because being poor in the United States was generally regarded as something morally wrong. If you could not "make it" in the land of opportunity, the fault was thought to lie in the moral fiber of the person who failed to achieve success.

The rest of the people--those who were neither controlled nor excluded from participation--were the ones whose loyalty could be taken for granted. Our main new group of citizens each era, of course, were the European immigrants that came to the United States, decade after decade, and their children, who provided the United States, with its young workers. For the immigrants, the U.S. was clearly the land of opportunity and dignity, particularly in comparison to the regimes the immigrants came from. Unless something happened here to destroy the loyalty immigrants had brought with them, our system could take their allegiance as citizens for granted. At first, the immigrants were farmers and artisans, then, industrialization came and immigrants became workers. When they found that industrial work did not provide the economic security and dignity they felt they were entitled to, they turned to union affiliation and protest as a way to secure participation in decisions over their working lives and in society as a whole. During the last quarter of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century, American workers created a new balance of power between themselves and management, and themselves and other groups in society.

My basic point is that the movement into unions was still within the system, despite a few minor strands in the labor movement advocating socialist solutions for the problems of the worker. The labor movement became the instrument by which immigrant workers and their children demanded and got a participating share in our system of rewards and representation. The entry of American workers into the union movement proved that the American constitutional system was broad enough to encompass the needs of these workers and keep their allegiance.

What we must recognize now is that a large number of our new "young workers" are coming from groups who were formerly kept outside the system. Here are the new waves of Negroes, other non-whites, and the poor. There are also children of earlier immigrant groups who are much less secure than were their parents; they can no longer claim special privileges simply because they are white or northern European, and many are fearful and often hostile toward the new groups with whom they must compete in relative equality. This hostility frequently spills over onto the new rules of American society which deny whites the old security of special privilege.

Since the new groups of non-whites and the poor are now in the political system and mean to stay, we must ask what their view of American society is and will be. If the educational system does not communicate American society's openness and its capacity for change, and explain the reasons for retaining our constitutional system, then we will have a large group of voters and a large group of persons in the streets against the system. If the American constitutional system today is not seen as being truly open to the new groups, in terms of opportunity and dignity, and if they do not develop a feeling of allegiance to it, we all realize the system cannot function. And, if it denies opportunity and dignity to a quarter of its population, after that issue has been posed as squarely to a society as it has been to ours in the past decade, we must ask whether such a system deserves continued allegiance. In fact, the lesson of the past five years is that the new groups will not let American society conduct "business as usual."

If you follow this line of analysis, it becomes clear that trying to talk about citizenship education for the young worker is difficult in terms of the way we normally think about the processes of education. For example, when you talk about civil liberties and civil rights to children who go to school in Scarsdale, New York, they have a very different attitude than young workers would have. For Scarsdale youngsters, the system means deferential police and a father with influence in politics. They know that they are going to be a part of the managerial society and so you are talking about their system. On the other hand, when you talk to a child in Harlem or in the Watts district of Los Angeles or in the south side of Chicago, you are talking about a system he does not identify with, that seems to be against him, that does not offer him opportunity. It will not work to say to the Harlem child that, in historical terms, the framers wrote the Fourth Amendment in order to give us protection against the writs of assistance and British general searches, and expect this to have any meaning for him. Nor can we even talk to him about a current civil liberties and civil rights issue, such as the dispute over due process guarantees, unless you give him some sen se of reality about the way his cousin, his brother, or his father is treated in the police station. So the notion that simply getting better textbooks or getting a better technicolor film about the Founding Fathers, or getting a good case discussion going, and somehow reaching children with this kind of communication is completely wrong. We are dealing with the necessity of breaking through decades of their belief that the system, politics, and law are not their heritage but, instead, are weapons to be used against them.

The challenge of citizenship education for young workers, then, is to find a way to communicate the continuing ideals of our constitutional system, explain the progress we have made toward institutionalizing and achieving these ideals, and persuade young workers to become active citizens in the struggle to expand these achievements in the workers' own needs and interests. Such education for young workers takes place at two basic stages: in public and vocational schools, and while they are on the job as adults. During these two periods, workers may receive education from five sources--the schools, communities during the time of schooling, unions, corporations, and adult public education. Since problems of communication and approach are different in each area, perhaps the best thing I can do is to indicate briefly what seem to be the opportunities, the difficulties, and the questions for each one of these five.

First of all, take the schools. One of the great difficulties in education about American liberties is that this subject is not a high priority item in vocational education. It is often thought of as part of the "cultural trimmings," and not centrally important for the person heading out to work. When it comes to academically oriented students, those going on to college, we often have adequate formal curricula about our constitutional system in history, government, and social studies. But when you are dealing with people who are going out into the work force, the theory is often: just lay on a quick brush work and that will have to serve, because they are not interested and it is not something that can occupy a major part of their program.

And yet "one man, one vote" is our system. The vote that is going to be exercised by the worker should mean as much as the vote of any of us here. Unless we understand that we need new ways to put significant and powerful stress on citizenship education for those going the vocational education route, we are going to turn out a lot of people who do not have the basic understanding which will lead to active identification and participation in community and political life.

Even if the vocational curriculum can be expanded to provide more work on our constitutional system, the question remains, how do we get past the sense of alienation and disbelief on the part of many of those who will move on to the industrial work force? After all, they watch TV, and listen to the debates in our society; they do see the low estimate of themselves and their future that so much of the mass media conveys. How do we change this in education? Can we do it through courses? With the current crop of teachers? With the present school structure? Do we need a whole new approach to education for life in the community? These are the questions on our agenda at this conference.

Secondly, take the idea of community education at the time the young worker is still in school. How do you get them to come? Why should someone who is 12, or 14, or 16, come to anything representing education that is held after school? Even if they did come, who will run it? Is it run by the school system as after hours activity? Is it run by civic groups who will appeal to young people to come, and become active in a group that teaches them a citizenship role? What about parents' groups, community houses, and other neighborhood organizations? What kind of role should you give young people to play in their community, that would be outside the school, but that would teach them the value of self-expression as they come into adolescence?

Let me turn now to the question of corporations. First, should corporations get into this area at all? Not long ago, I wrote an article on corporate programs of education in the field of American institutions. The article traced the movement of corporations in the field of economic education, public affairs, and the practical politics courses, and then described the programs on Communism that were being sponsored by hundreds of major corporations, particularly in the 1960's. After discussing John Birch Society material that was being used by a small number of corporations, the excellent and imaginative programs that had been developed by many leading corporations, and the sense of participation in intellectual and political life in the country that had come through these first rate programs, I ended up with suggested standards that would distinguish a good and objective program from corporate propaganda in the guise of education, and said that I hoped corporations would continue this development.

I got an angry letter from one professor, a leading political scientist, who said corporations had no business in this field at all. Education is for the educational community. Corporations exist to make a profit, pay their workers, and pay dividends. Corporate programs, he said, would have to be indoctrination and not education, and it would distort the nature of the business system for corporations to engage in anything other than job-related training.

I don't share this view because it seems to me that we should not surrender (if that is the right word) the total system of education to any group of professional educators. I believe in the public school system and I believe in the system of professional education at the graduate level, but I also think there are many other worthwhile forums of education in our society. It is a strength rather than a weakness that properly designed and properly carried out programs are part of the educational system of our civic business and private group system. But it does raise serious questions about whether corporations should engage in the kind of citizenship education that I am describing. If they do should they engage in it alone? Should they be management-run programs? Or should they be run jointly with the unions? Is the ideal model one which is used by some corporations, in which scholarships are given for employees to go to private or public institutions, but with time or tuition contributed by the company.

As for labor unions as an educational leader in the citizenship field, most unions have limited themselves to training union leaders or potential union leaders coming up through the ranks. Education in civil liberties and civil rights for the average worker has been limited to articles on these subjects in union newspapers, with occasional special issues about these problems. Of course like corporations, unions have been interested in having their members become more active in political affairs and the Political Action Committee is a long standing union technique for stimulating citizenship activity on behalf of labor interests. The problem is, can a union, or should a union, become active in educational programs on American liberties for their rank-and-file? What does this do in terms of the authority relationships between members and officers? A serious problem is whether the unions can spare the money needed for educational programs. They do cost money, and one of the crucial questions is where financial support would come from in the union community for pilot programs or large scale education for rank and file members, since resources on the corporate or government scale are lacking.

In dealing with the final area adult public education, we are faced with many of the same problems as we are in planning education in the community for young workers still in school. Why would anyone attend classes--what would motivate adults, who have already developed a pattern of life and a view of their place in or out of the system to take the time and effort to learn more about American liberties and citizenship. Under whose auspices would such classes be taught--or should they be formal classes at all?

We don't have waiting for you a package of decisive proposals to answer these questions. We hope that you will think and talk about these questions during our conference. We believe the field of citizenship education for the young worker is one in which our Center should work. We seek ideas on where effort should be put. We have brought you together so that we can talk about what has already been done by corporations, unions, schools and communities and to see what existing programs can suggest to us for the future. We have come here to learn from you and to invite your concern for this area of citizenship education in the coming decade.

* * *

The first Saturday morning session was devoted to "Citizenship Education in the School Systems," and was chaired by Richard Nelson, Director of Public Relations, the Inland Steel Company. Professor F. W. Whittemore, Chairman of the Department of Social Studies, Teachers College, presented the overview paper on school citizenship education--"Vocational Education, the Social Studies and Citizenship Training."

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, THE SOCIAL STUDIES, AND CITIZENSHIP TRAINING

Professor F. W. Whittemore

For the second time in this century Americans are giving special attention to vocational education, and for essentially the same reasons as before. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 was the nation's first major commitment to technical training as part of our public school program; the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is our new charter, departing as it does from all previous legislation in the field. Each act, in its own time, manifested a public awareness of two developments characteristic of our age: the rising threshold of economic opportunity; and the dehumanizing tendencies of urban society.

While technological know-how and specialization were creating the most efficient economic system in history, the unskilled were becoming an army of residuals concentrating in the great metropolitan areas. Both the Smith-Hughes Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1963 attacked the obvious problems of lag between the obsolescent skills of the displaced rural migrants and the evermore sophisticated requirements of the job market. Only by implication, however, did they confront the social problem of human obsolescence. In our culture, gainful employment is necessary to self-esteem; even gainful employment in a highly specialized and impersonal situation is unlikely to establish that sense of worth essential to the free man. The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, in its report of 1918, gave clear expression to this dilemma.

> With increasing specialization in any society comes a corresponding necessity for increased attention to unification. The doctrine that each individual has a right to opportunity to develop the best that is in him is re-enforced by the belief in the potential, and perchance, the unique worth of the individual. The task of education, as for life, is therefore to bring forth that potential worth . . . . The secondary school must be equally zealous to develop those

> common ideas, common ideals and common modes of thought, feeling and action, whereby America through a rich, unified, common life may render her truest service to a world seeking for democracy among men and nations.

This report on the reorganization of secondary education, influtial as it was in establishing the organizational and curricular patterns for our public secondary schools that have endured from that day to this, failed in its primary goal, the goal of fusing general and vocation education into a truly liberating experience. We still have not effected this fusion. The difference between 1918 and 1966, is that we can no longer bear the cost of failure.

Archibald MacLeish once asked "How do you make a man want to be free?" I think that among other things, you give him a liberal education. This holds for the young worker as well as the college bound youth. We have failed the young worker in this regard because we have, in his case, divorced the vocational from the general in his training. We have forgotten that whatever his technical skills, he cannot find his place in our free society unless he has learned to think of himself as a participant in a rationally ordered political, social and economic system. Such a self-image is not easy to cultivate in a mass society. Complexity looks very much like chaos from across the tracks.

We are not here concerned with vocational education as such. Let us note only that under the recent act, the definition of vocational education is expanded to include all training for gainful employment below the professional level. What we are concerned with at this conference is citizenship education for the young worker. We want him to enter adulthood with a proprietary interest in liberty, equality and justice--the kind of interest described so eloquently last night by Senator Yarborough and Professor Westin. We want him to treasure his liberty and his rights as living proof of individual worth and to act upon them, to take that responsible role in the decision making process that is the glory of democratic citizenship.

The importance of vocational education is obvious enough--no training, no job; no job, no sense of personal worth. Yet this is but one leg in the triangulation necessary to the balanced whole. We must, in addition, provide the citizen worker with both the rational bases for understanding the world around him and, as the third and unifying leg, a clear perception of the meaning and significance of American liberties. Our attention at this conference is focused on this third leg but unfortunately we know very little about how to proceed on this line. I am certain of one thing however: the citizenship education of which we speak cannot be carried on in isolation, as a separate subject.

Let me speak for a moment or two about the development of these rational bases for understanding which are, I am convinced, the prerequisites for any effective citizenship education. If we choose as among the many worthy objectives that have been assigned to the social studies, the two already described this morning--namely the development of the rational bases for understanding human affairs and the development of a proprietary interest in liberty, justice and equality--we have both the organizing principles for a social studies program and a viable approach to citizenship education.

History and social sciences, which are the parent disciplines of the social studies, represent man's best efforts to describe himself and his societies. As such they provide the rational bases for understanding human affairs. Today's citizens can deal with the world they live in only when they command these resources of knowledge--resources the school can no longer supply simply by adding to the store of information that the student is asked to master. As the philosopher, Philip Phenix, has put it, "The crisis in learning consists in the disproportion of what is available and necessary to know and the capacity of the individual to know it."[1] We cannot expect to produce universal men in the 18th century sense, of course, but this necessary knowledge is not beyond him who masters, what Phenix calls, the "key concepts" that govern each of the fields of study.

The key concepts of history and the social sciences should, then, be the articulating principles of a sound social studies sequence; from kindergarten through the 12th grade their parallel development should be the central purpose of the program. Being as essentially simple as they are powerful, there is every reason to believe that these concepts are within the reach of the academically retarded on the one hand, while, on the other, they can serve as the bases for the most sophisticated understandings of which the collegebound student is capable.

The social studies program so articulated will emphasize the ways of knowing characteristic of the social sciences rather than the accumulation of information for its own sake. "We must look at things in the large," said Voltaire, "for the very reason that the human mind is so small and sinks under the weight of minutiae." The individual familiar with the key concepts of the social sciences may indeed see things in the large. He may cope rationally with the great mass of ideas and data that scholarship and the modern world make available and necessary to him as a functioning citizen.

To illustrate these key concepts let us look at history and geography. In passing, you may notice the parallel idea of the structure of a field of knowledge.[2] The historian is always trying to explain change and continuity. Inevitably, he sees the past through the eyes of the present for, as Benedetto Croce put it, "All history is contemporaneous," in that it is always present in thought about the past. This condition is a natural function of the historian's sources. Historical events are unique and, by definition, beyond the range of direct observation. Thus the historian's synthesis is always an interpretation of the past. The historical method of dealing with historical sources is therefore necessary not only to the writing of history, but to the understanding of history's key concepts. No doubt you are aware that the study and practice of historical method is ordinarily reserved for the graduate student, but there really is nothing complicated about it. It is simply a common sense, rational way of handling the unsatisfactory data with which the historian must work. Even a primary grade child can grasp the essence of the method. It may be said then, that the key concepts of history are change and interpretation; they determine the kinds of questions that the historian may properly ask. Indeed, they must govern anyone looking to the past for guidance. To think rationally in the dimension of time, the student must know the conceptual framework within which he operates, the character of historical evidence, and the relative uncertainty of his judgments.

---

[1] Philip Phenix, "Key Concepts and the Crisis in Learning." Teachers College Record, V. 58 (Dec. 1956), 138.

[2] Ibid.

What about geography? The geographer works in the dimension of space even as the historian works in the dimension of time. He seeks to identify systems of real relationships, systems that he calls regions. Thus the region is the key concept of geography. The geographer's regionalism abstracts from reality, in order to explain significant man-place relationships. It is both a way of looking at the world and a method of ordering the complexities of man's spatial experience.

Like history and geography, each of the other social sciences has its key concepts. I believe that these central ideas should be the organizing principles of a social studies curriculum. The student should be introduced to the dimensions of time, space, and culture and be familiarized, over the years, with the modes of thought and inquiry that man has found useful for understanding human affairs.

I am not suggesting a revolution in the curriculum; the important innovations will be in the selection of content and the strategies of presentation. Building on the concepts introduced in elementary school, secondary school social studies will lead students to question, compare and interpret rather than to stockpile information. Parenthetically, I should say that I am speaking of programs for all students whom we expect to take a citizen's part in the decision making process, not just the college bound. There will be a preference in these programs for studies in depth, the teacher always looking to the scholar for help in defining those topics which are important enough to warrant intensive examination.

There is today a powerful movement in this direction. This is not an approach that I worked over in my mind last night and decided throw at you today. I think you are all familiar with the United States Office of Education's Project Social Studies. It has established a baker's dozen of curriculum development centers at various universities around the country. All of them are attempting to develop social studies curricula and teaching strategies in harmony with the basic approach that I have described. They are concerned that students learn to think in rationally appropriate terms about the problems of the world that they are bound to live in.

In addition to the efforts of the United States Office of Education, professional organizations of teachers and scholars have worked cooperatively to bridge the gap between scholarship and the classroom. The National Council for the Social Studies has produced six yearbooks, including one on citizenship, with this purpose in mind.[3] The National Council has also collaborated with the American Council of Learned Societies on a book called *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences* that attempts to identify the important ideas from history and the social sciences that should be the essential ingredients of a secondary social studies program.[4] Meanwhile the American Historical Association has done yeoman service through its Service Center for Teachers of History in producing a number of pamphlets designed to acquaint teachers with the latest in historical scholarship. The purpose is to help the teacher in the necessary business of keeping abreast of historical knowledge. In history, particularly, the schools are already taking their cues from this massive effort to vitalize social studies programs. Both gifted and average students are being weaned from the textbook. The historical method of establishing facts is stressed while the wealth of source and interpretive material now available in paperback form is being used to develop new and truly liberalizing courses.

Perhaps you have been wondering what became of my topic, citizenship education? I am convinced that prolonged involvement with the substance and processes of knowledge may be expected to cultivate an appreciation of what Columbia University's Bicentenary Committee called "man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof." The citizen so educated cannot but recognize his stake in American liberties. This recognition is the *sine qua non* of citizenship education.

Pressure for a reform in the social studies as in citizenship education, comes as a reaction to two related problems characteristic of our civilization--the fantastic reaches of human knowledge and the stupefying complexity of the issues facing our urban and industrial society. Obviously our people are in danger of being left behind in a kind of relative ignorance that could be fatal to democracy. If the individual finds his world incomprehensible, it becomes absurd; in such a world the only sensible value is self-gratification. Unfortunately it is most often the city dweller and his children whose confusing circumstances dictate this logic of futility. Manifestly, the familiar social studies program, with its nod in the direction of citizenship education, is no longer adequate, particularly as we find it in the vocational schools of our cities. The programs as I have observed them, are perfunctory. They are attempts to forcefeed information that has little or no meaning for the vocational student, not because he is duller than others, but because he lacks the intellectual skills for processing the information. We have not provided these intellectual means which are, in turn, the bases for understanding one's own role in a free society.

---

[3] Roy A. Price, ed., *New Viewpoints in the Social Sciences*, National Council for the Social Studies, 1958; Preston E. James, ed., *New Viewpoints in Geography*, N.C.S.S., 1959; Franklin Patterson, ed., *Citizenship in a Free Society: Education for the Future*, N.C.S.S., 1960; W. H. Cartwright and R. L. Watson, Jr., eds., *Interpreting and Teaching American History*, N.C.S.S., 1961; Helen M. Carpenter, ed., *Skill Development in Social Studies*, N.C.S.S., 1963; Shirley H. Engle, ed., *New Perspectives in World History*, N.C.S.S., 1964.

[4] Bernard Berelson, *et al*, *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences*, Harcourt, Brace and World, N. Y., 1962.

The capstone of a sound social studies program for the young worker is experience in the real world, experience that introduces the student as a rational, free man to the day to day business of running his free society. If we can find ways to do this, we can have a citizenship education program worthy of the name. Perhaps the vocational dimension of schooling affords the setting. I hope this conference will explore that possibility. If the young worker discovers that American liberties do exist, however imperfectly, he will have proof of our society's commitment to individual dignity and worth--his dignity and worth.

* * *

Walter M. Arnold, Assistant Commissioner for Vocational and Technical Education, United States Office of Education, commented on the U.S.O.E. paper on current programs for vocational and technical students. The paper, in shortened form which, like the other summaries below, preserves the language of the original, is as follows:

CITIZENSHIP TRAINING FOR VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL STUDENTS

By the Division of Vocational and Technical Education,
U.S. Office of Education

A democratic society must promise its citizens an opportunity to cultivate independence of thought, judgment, and action. Its citizens must possess the ability to question existing patterns of thought, to support a point of view, and to express that point of view effectively.

Vocational education must contribute to overcoming the apathy and the pressure of group opinion which inhibit democratic action. We must measure our contribution to individual development in terms of training in the exercise of our students' critical faculties and in terms of the opportunities we offer for exercise of those faculties within the educational experience.

Students enrolled in vocational-technical programs in secondary schools have a unique opportunity to obtain practical experience in the responsibilities of citizenship and in insight into the meaning and importance of civil liberties.

Formal classroom instruction in the social studies, such as American history, government, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and civics, provides the base for experiencing and understanding civil liberties, civil rights, and the responsibilities of citizenship. Vocational students must complete the same requirements in these areas as other students.

But there are serious limitations in the use of the formal classroom situation alone for providing students the opportunities to exercise sufficiently their civil liberties and to achieve social and civic competence. The shop and laboratory environments, in which the students associate freely and share equally in the work assignments, reinforces the classroom experiences and enables students to be habitually attuned to the civil liberties, rights, and responsibilities necessary for democratic citizenship. Organization and management techniques employed in shops and laboratories also offer students many opportunities to practice on the job and in the community good habits relating to civil liberties and other aspects of citizenship.

The close relationship that exists between the vocational instructor and his students and the unregimented but purposeful working together are conducive to the teaching and practicing of the important freedoms, rights, obligations, and loyalties to which good citizens aspire. The ideals of brotherhood and equality are constantly in evidence through the sharing of responsibility for getting the work assignments done. Respect for public and private property is engendered through the sharing of tools, machines, and materials.

Vocational students are taught in many ways the dignity of labor. With the goal of gainful employment constantly before them, they are made aware that our democracy gives an individual the right to work in an occupation of his own choosing and in terms of his own abilities, provided such work does not interfere with the rules imposed by society. Students are encouraged to take advantage of opportunities for self-development and to aspire to their rightful status as producing members of a free society.

By precept and example, and through the force of group opinion guided by the instructor, vocational students are taught to respect the opinions of others, to be tolerant of others' religious beliefs, to respect the flag, to serve in the armed services when needed, to vote in choosing leaders and representatives, to support elected representatives, to pay taxes determined by proper representatives, to meet financial obligations, to assist law enforcement personnel in preventing crime and in apprehending criminals.

Students in the cooperative program, in which they attend school part-time and work part-time, have a special opportunity to develop real understanding of the meaning of good citizenship and of the workings of our American economic system. The employer, serving as an adjunct instructor, helps instill understanding of individual rights and responsibilities. Association with fellow workers gives the student first-hand knowledge of the rights, freedoms, and responsibilities of workers in our democracy.

Youth organizations sponsored by or related to vocational education programs provide opportunities for the practice of responsible citizenship. These national organizations at present include the Future Farmers of America, the Future Homemakers of America, the Distributive Clubs of America, and the Vocational Industrial Clubs of America. Through participation in the professional, civic, and charitable activities of the respective youth organization, students develop individual initiative and determination to defend one's rights and beliefs.

Student government in its various forms is also an excellent means for providing opportunities to experience the components of good citizenship and to practice the rights and civil liberties guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

Although many fine practices are in evidence in many schools throughout the nation, much remains to be done in developing understanding of the meaning of American liberties. Vocational education is in a strategic position to exert leadership in the promotion of the civil liberties and civil rights implicit to good citizenship.

* * *

Professor Jerry Rosenberg of Teachers College presented his model of a new approach to teaching American liberties. His paper, in shortened form, is as follows:

To get away from the straight lecture followed by a few questions from students, a new attitude toward sensitizing the learner is desirable. One of the many areas of inquiry that needs this flexibility is in teaching the issues of American liberties in the classrooms of schools, industry, and labor.

The following methodology would both measure the students' grasp of the materials covered, and enable students to debate, confront and learn from one another's experience.

Although variations may evolve, the basic design would include six phases, each one followed through on three levels, or steps. For Step I students would deal with a civil liberties issue as presented in a book chapter, magazine article, film, etc. For Step II they would prepare and use case studies of issues which are relevant to the real problems they wish to solve. For Step III, they would deal with real problems which they are in a position to do something about.

Students would go through all six phases for Step I a few times, to learn the discipline of the technique, before moving to Step II. With some groups Step II could be skipped--for example, if they were familiar enough with the kind of problem they wanted to deal with in Step III so that they did not need the practice of related case studies.

Phase one is student preparation--reading of articles, preparation of case studies, or study of a real problem. In phase two, a task is performed by individuals working on their own--a test in the material or case studies, or an attempt at individual solution to the real problem. In phase three the same task is performed by small competing groups, producing a score for each group. For Step III, the entire group tries to work out an agreed upon solution to their real problem.

In phase four, groups compare their scores and the groups are ranked by how well they scored, in Steps I and II. For Step III, the group at this point acts on its solution. In phase five each small group examines the way in which it arrived at group answers, and how interaction within the group helped or hindered the group in getting a high group score. For Step III, the group evaluates the success of its action.

In phase six, insights from the articles or case studies are discussed by the whole group, in relation to real issues, at Steps I and II. For Step III, the group analyses how it arrived at its plan of action and how this process helped or hinderd its chances for effective action, and makes plans for further action, using the insights it has gained.

The Process Schedule is represented diagramatically on the following page.

This methodology requires relatively little lecturing from the teacher, but much effort from the participant. The instructor has an opportunity to listen in on problem-solving discussions of the groups and to observe the students examining group processes. The student must read, discuss, compete (both as an individual and as part of a group), and evaluate. Experience has demonstrated that this approach can overcome to an important degree the common tendency of teachers to "talk at" the class.

As the teaching role is de-emphasized in this methodology, a proportionately greater demand is placed on the development of quality teaching materials. Therefore, tests and other student tasks must be prepared with the utmost care.

Process Schedule

	Phase I	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5	Phase 6
Step I	Selected reading or film	Task performed by individual	Task performed by competing groups	Feedback and ranking of groups	Small group critique	Application and discussion of content
Step II	Cases (prepared) by participants or assigned)	Task performed by individual	Task performed by competing groups	Feedback and ranking of groups	Small group critique	Application and discussion of cases
Step III	Real problems needing action	Individual attempt at solution	Group attempt at solution	Action on final recommendation	Evaluation	Analysis, restructuring, further action

Utilizing such concepts as task variation, rapid feedback, and intergroup competition, participant motivation tends to be sustained at a high level. Students appear to achieve significant cognitive and affective learning, and are able to develop a useful style of problem-solving.

* * *

The second session on Saturday morning dealt with "Citizenship and Public Affairs Education in Corporations." The chairman was Clarence Walton, Dean of the Faculty of General Studies, Columbia University. Thomas J. Diviney, Assistant Vice President, Division of Public Affairs Research, National Industrial Conference Board, presented the overview paper on corporate public affairs education.

CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION IN CORPORATIONS

Thomas J. Diviney

When Shakespeare wrote the phrase ". . . what's past is prologue, . . ." little did he know when, where, or how often it might be used. So, at the risk of taking liberties with its meaning, I suggest that the short history of public affairs which follows is but an introduction to the future.

Another thought pertinent to our examination of the subject is found in the words of Harvard Professor Ralph Hidy. Addressing a group of businessmen students, he says: "Every man should know where he is in the stream of history, how he got there, and where he seems to be going." And, as if to lay emphasis on personal responsibility for the common good, he adds: "More than that, businessmen--through their instruments and institutions, especially corporations--stand as one of the power centers in the society of the western world."

While there is an absence of unanimity in the business community as to the meaning of public affairs, a consensus appears to be emerging. Some businessmen have used the term to mean political action or relations with government. Others have identified it with influencing legislation or lobbying. At times the expression has been used interchangeably with public relations. However, a recent study by The Conference Board which involved over a thousand corporate executives sheds new light on the matter. A majority of this group uses the term broadly, though selectively, to embrace political education and action, participation in government, knowledge of public issues, economic education, community involvement, and corporate philanthropy.

The Conference Board subscribes to a broad definition. In announcing the creation of its Division of Public Affairs Research, the Board used this description: "A significant and substantial concern by individuals, business and labor organizations, private institutions, and government with those social economic, and political forces that singly and through interaction shape the environment of the society in which private, free enterprise exists."

Public affairs, as it concerns politics and government only, had its domestic genesis in colonial America. David Galligan in his monograph "Politics and the Businessman" put it succinctly in one paragraph:

> Business has always played a major role in American politics. Our founding fathers drafted the Constitution with the interests of business in mind. In the period preceding the Civil War the foundations of modern-day industry were built, and the captains of industry emerged after the war to help develop and expand the economic potential of our country. Throughout our history there is demonstrable proof to show that businessmen have always taken a vital interest in the affairs of government.

Others who have spoken or written about the subject have expressed the view that what we observe is not something new. The evidence is to the contrary. What appears in the center of our spotlight is a broad-based, newly created function built into the organization structure of many companies. It is to the birth and growth of that new movement we address ourselves. As we do, it may be useful to ask who is involved and why.

There are at least four major segments of society concerned with and affected by public affairs. They sometimes overlap in interests or merge in organization, but basically they retain their respective identities. They are:

1. The general public or major parts of it, called the public sector,

2. The government sector,

3. Business, sometimes called the private sector, and

4. The independent sector, which embraces a host of groups or agencies such as churches, labor organizations, service clubs, foundations, and many others.

The relationships between these four are constantly changing. One sector may retreat somewhat while another advances to greater public view. All move closer together as they attend to the affairs of the community, the nation, the world, and the universe. New points of contact are developing constantly. Sometimes the contacts are collisions. Sometimes they occur without our knowing it. Such relationships are healthy providing the parties maintain focus, communications, and relative balance with each other.

Take your eyes off one sector, and you lose perspective with respect to all sectors. Clog the communications lines between sectors, and you'll find created a host of costly and enduring errors.

Some of these errors are uncomfortably present with us today. For example, Appalachia and slums testify to a neglect of the public sector. The predicament of state legislatures speaks of neglect of the government sector. Regulations and controls sometimes evidence a misunderstanding of the business sector and the failure of business to communicate with government and the public.

Now let's get down to specifics.

Perhaps the most significant date involved is August 8, 1952; the place: Denver, Colorado; the occasion: a small meeting held at the invitation of Dwight Eisenhower, who, as you know, founded the American Assembly here at Arden House. The Denver meeting was attended by a few energetic young men whose principal bond was their association with the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. One of these men was H. Bruce Palmer, now president of The Conference Board. The discussion, which ran into the early morning hours, was basically centered on the question: Does not the businessman have a responsibility in helping to form and guide the society in which we live? Irrespective of his political affiliation, does he not owe it to himself, his corporate shareowners, his family and the public, to take an active part in shaping the destiny of the country?

This question was answered in the affirmative. As a result, the Committee for Young Men in Government was formed. Meetings and conversations over the months that followed led to the incorporation of the Effective Citizens Organization. This association, more than any other, laid the foundation for the public affairs movement. ECO came into being at Chicago, in December, 1954. Shortly afterward, a small professional staff was obtained, and again Bruce Palmer helped launch the new venture by providing space and giving financial support.

Early efforts to create local chapters proved unsuccessful, but by 1956 a format had been designed to engender interest and encourage participation on the part of businessmen through a workshop in politics. The first of these workshops sponsored by the Effective Citizens Organization was held at Princeton University. Many others followed at colleges and universities throughout the country.

From 1954 to 1958 you could have counted public affairs pioneers on your ten fingers. They included among others: Johnson & Johnson, Allen-Bradley Company, Republic Steel, and Ford Motor. General Electric initiated business-climate studies in plant communities.

A well-publicized failure during the early years raised doubts in the minds of many businessmen. One company created a public affairs program with two major defects. First, it had an anti-labor bias, and second, it sought to use employees to gather information on the public and private activities of congressmen for dossiers to be kept on each legislator. Reactions were immediate and strong. The company was forced to scrap its program and to shape another with radically different objectives. The public affairs platform in the business community was shaken, but it did not collapse.

Confidence, purpose, and effective action emerged when the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, under the leadership of St. Louis banker William McDonnell, established its Political Participation Committee with publisher "Red" Motley as its first Chairman. This step was taken on the recommendation of Palmer, who was to succeed Motley in chairing the committee.

By January of 1959 the Chamber had produced what has come to be generally accepted as a sound, basic course of instruction in the art of practical politics. Completely nonpartisan (reviewed and approved prior to publication by both major political parties), this simple instructional device literally caught on like wildfire. Seven years later it is still popular, and while no one knows for certain how many persons have taken the course, there is good reason to believe that the figure exceeds half a million.

Other efforts were under way concurrently. One of these was a group-employer political education project, usually referred to as the "Syracuse Plan." In 1961 the National Association of Manufacturers published a political education kit entitled "Citizens at Work--Economic Background of Politics." Sometime in 1962 it issued another "Political Education Seminar."

It would take more time than this occasion will permit to describe the variations of instructional forms that were designed and adopted by many companies to acquaint employees with the political process. In some instances they consisted merely of exposing employees to talks by local office-holders. In other cases they represented an abbreviated version of the U. S. Chamber course. In still others, parts of the Chamber course were supplemented with limited information about local or state government. In any event, more businessmen have learned what makes the wheels turn in the political machine in the past ten years than was probably the case in the previous half century.

Let's pause here to examine the motives that prompted businessmen to get involved in public affairs in this more conscious, more organized, and more effective way in the late fifties and early sixties.

In the business sector, a technological revolution had brought the nation more wealth as well as higher unemployment, greater opportunities for the skilled and fewer for the unskilled. Leaders in business and science were engineering breakthroughs but they were neglecting to anticipate socio-economic problems and plan solutions.

The businessman in the forefront of research, engineering, manufacturing, and sales had failed to communicate effectively with the government and public sectors on his role in and daily contribution to the public interest. To many outside the business community, the business leader seemed strangely silent--even unconcerned with the public interest.

There is probably no single reason that can be ascribed to the birth and the development of the public affairs movement. Like most activities involving a multitude of human beings, motivation may differ as do the individuals themselves. However, some things, more than others, caused corporate management to inaugurate a public affairs function. One company president put it this way: "Government has grown in size and importance. There is no expectation that there will be any diminution in the activities of government. Its impingement on the operations of our company and others is such that we can no longer afford to ignore its existence."

Other executives pointed to the mounting cost of doing business, attributable in no small part to heavy taxation. While it was a businessman who first suggested that the federal government is a partner of business since the federal income tax represented approximately 50 percent of corporate earnings, this partnership was later to be acknowledged by President Kennedy on the same grounds.

There are those who say that traditionally Republican businessmen were shocked into action by the 1958 elections, in which Republican candidates fared so poorly.

Another theory is that there had developed a growing realization that the major thrust of international labor unions had shifted from seeking improved wages, hours, and working conditions to the betterment of the working classes through the governmental--especially legislative--processes.

In this connection our recitation would be incomplete were we not to acknowledge that labor unions have been active politically through a number of affiliated groups or sections. Probably the best known of these is the Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO, called COPE. Whatever the merits of the Chamber's Action Course in Practical Politics, no one could gainsay the fact that COPE had earlier published an instructional volume on politics entitled "How to Win." This booklet was widely used before the advent of the Chamber course, and it has been viewed by those competent to judge as a simple, sensible, practical book of instructions.

But as long as we are talking about motivation, it may be well to mention one or two other things.

Some executives felt that, however useful trade associations were or are, they did not get results in governmental affairs as beneficial as those which they might achieve through their own efforts. So many concluded that it is just good business to help put competent people in public office, to know them and to have them know you, and to take a stand for or against governmental action that affects your industry or your company. A report by ECO shows that a definite dollar sign can be placed on such activities. How? By the avoidance of inequitable taxes, in forestalling unnecessary regulation, and in numerous other ways.

There are signs, too, that a kind of evolutionary process has taken place in the last decade. More enlightened businessmen now see themselves as their companies obligated to act in the public interest. More of them are accepting the fact that, by their action or inaction, they can influence the environment in which they live and conduct their business. More are beginning to appreciate that science and technology have helped to create socio-economic problems calling for research in the social as well as the physical sciences.

In addition to political education, much has been done to help businessmen to be better informed about the issues of the day. More businessmen are attending conferences to learn about public issues; more are examining the pros and cons of proposed legislation. Hundreds of companies are providing information to employees through plant papers, office memos, public affairs bulletins, newsletters, and legislative directories.

There is also more identification with office-holders. In the past it was not unusual to ignore a newly elected official, especially if he happened to be from the other party. Now it is a more common practice to develop a sound and businesslike relationship with the congressman, the state senator, or other official who has been elected to represent the district in which the plant or office is located.

Time was when an employee would inquire whether his job would *preclude running for public office. Too often the response was vaguely* negative. Since the advent of the public affairs movement, thousands of employees have accepted appointments, or been elected to public office. Their jobs range all the way from local boards of education to state and national posts.

There were several factors that inhibited public affairs in the business community. While this may oversimplify, I should like to name three.

In the first place, the business community is pluralistic. Unanimity does not exist. Common agreement on principles, to say nothing of methods or means, is the exception--not the rule. Government, by contrast, tends to be monolithic, highly visible, with conspicuous leadership, willing and able to respond in a concerted manner. ECO and the U. S. Chamber might develop communications and instruction programs, but the public sector sought imaginative thinking, the expenditure of large sums of money, the implementation of remedial programs. The suitors were unequally matched.

Secondly, many thoughtful executives were concerned lest office-holders, shareowners, labor unions, customers, or employees might misunderstand their motives. Many more thought that public affairs would make every employee a politician or a lobbyist, thereby unleashing amateur efforts in highly sensitive areas.

Finally, there were the questions of how to permit participation by supervisory employees without detracting from their job responsibilities, how to get rank-and-file workers into the act so as not to run into trouble with unions on the one hand, or stockholders on the other.

These questions or problems still exist in the minds of many, usually those who have not yet tested the temperature of the water. Company executives who have taken the plunge will tell you that most of the fears management entertained in the fifties were unfounded.

Some of the early starters in public affairs wrote a policy covering the rationale for entering public affairs, areas of program involvement, freedom of speech, and other matters. But many more companies couched their policy in vague, general terms, and still more preferred to get going first and write their policy later. Today, about 15 percent of those companies with a recognizable public affairs function have a written statement of policy.

At the beginning of the sixties, in-company public affairs functions reflected the chief executive's understanding of the subject. This meant that organization took many forms.

Ford Motor Company organized a department of civic and governmental affairs, divided the country into areas, and assigned a small governmental affairs staff to each region.

The Western Electric Company set up a public affairs deparment as part of its public relations division. The headquarters staff would serve as consultants to the operating units.

A current trend is to assign public affairs responsibilities to line management, write such duties into their job descriptions, and consider this factor among others in evaluating total job performance. This is the procedure Pittsburgh Plate Glass has followed.

Perhaps the area of public affairs that requires the most attention and greatest imagination is that of educating the general public and, more specifically, company employees in the free, private enterprise system.

Some say that economics is just now a popular subject. Others say there is no simple way to translate it into terms an average person can understand. Almost everyone agrees that there is too little economic education in high school and college. Even so, progress is being made, thanks to the Joint Council on Economic Education and others.

Whatever the problems, it seems clear that an understanding of the American capitalistic system is fundamental to intelligent political involvement on the part of voter and office-holder alike.

Some companies, notably Republic Steel, have done a creditable job in this area. The U. S. Chamber produced workshop materials for economic discussion groups with topics ranging from "The Mystery of Money" to "The Ethics of Capitalism." Later it published "Freedom versus Communism." Though widely used, it proved less popular than the practical politics course.

More recently, and perhaps more encouragingly, a few companies have developed their own economic education materials. The most recent one to come to my attention is entitled: "How You Make Your Living." Credit for this innovation goes to the Connecticut Light and Power Company. But a real breakthrough in economic education still remains to be made. Widespread success in this area is not yet a part of the history of public affairs.

It is regrettable that public affairs program directors have not had a greater supply of program material to draw upon. It takes time, imagination, and money to do the job well. However, man's extremity can also be his opportunity.

Over the years, many companies turned to their own organizations to establish and develop communication channels and materials for their employees. Among these, General Electric is a leader. You already know what has been done by Chase Manhattan Bank and Caterpillar Tractor Company. Dozens of others could be added to the list. Hughes Aircraft produced a color film to show how candidates running for election in California were introduced to Hughes employees. Sound slides by Olin and recordings by Western Electric are other examples of in-company public affairs communications.

Two areas in the realm of public affairs have received and continue to receive the attention of most businessmen. The first is personal participation in community affairs. It is hard to find companies that do not participate in local civic, community-related activities. Not only is it common to observe participation through executive manpower, but employees are widely encouraged to do their part. Their efforts are observed in numerous health and welfare organizations, church, cultural, and civic improvement groups, as well as such business-related efforts as Junior Achievement.

And here's an interesting example of personal involvement. On October 30, 1963, the Metropolitan Council of the American Jewish Congress and the Urban League of Greater New York announced the formation of the "Interracial Council for Business Opportunity." The Council's purpose--to strengthen and encourage the development of Negro-owned business enterprises in the New York City area.

Today, over 125 businessmen are working as volunteer I.C.B.O. consultants to Negroes desiring either to improve the profitability of their businesses or to enter businesses of their own.

The second area is corporate philanthropy. Today, corporate philanthropy amounts to more than $600 million annually. Nearly half of these dollars go to support education. A Conference Board study shows that corporate contributions to colleges and universities grew from $43 million in 1950 to $225 million in 1963. The estimate for 1966 is about $300 million. The records of the Community Chest, United Funds, and other such organizations give further testimony to the extent of corporate giving.

Unfortunately, there is no accurate method to establish the extent of public affairs involvement in a statistical sense. Head-counting is a popular pastime, and if it were possible to count the number of persons involved in public affairs in contrast to the number ten years ago, the comparison would undoubtedly be interesting. Some attempts have been made, but with relatively little success. The best one can do is to estimate.

This we know: ten years ago not more than a handful of companies had anything resembling a complete public affairs program. Today, by tallying membership in ECO, by counting the companies that have purchased thousands of copies of the Action Course in Practical Politics, by observing the attendance at public affairs conferences--it is clearly evident that the movement is widespread. Informed people estimate that at the very minimum over 500 corporations have clearly identifiable public affairs functions within their respective organizations. There is good reason to believe that this estimate is much lower than the actual count. A recent Conference Board survey tends to support this conclusion.

In any case, there is where we have been and how we got there. It is because we now look to the future that we have attempted to trace this picture of the past. Hopefully, much can be learned from its successes and its failures.

One thing we have learned according to President Harper of Alcoa, the time is at hand to turn from the quantitative problem. The businessman, says Mr. Harper, ". . . must direct his attention to qualitative questions." There are many to be sure, but one he must ask is: "How can I contribute to a business-government relationship that will yield the greatest possible benefits to all elements of our society, with particular concern for those whose welfare is affected directly by my decisions?

Returning now to my starting point, I recall the words of the Bard of Avon. If it is true that the "past is prologue," may we take the cue from Antonio and so conclude that "what is to come . . . is yours and mine to discharge."

* * *

Richard Armstrong, Executive Director of Effective Citizens, Inc., briefly discussed the criteria by which one can determine whether or not a company has a public affairs program, and described the lack of political sophistication and even of basic political knowledge which exists in the top echelons of management today.

James J. Maher, Vice President in Charge of Public Affairs at Chase Manhattan Bank, commented briefly on his paper, which describes the bank's public affairs program. His paper, in shortened form, is as follows.

PROGRAM OF THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK

The Chase Manhattan Effective Citizen Program was inaugurated in 1959. It is non-partisan in all respects and committed to the policy that (1) the political views of any staff member are his personal concern and (2) the political party in which he becomes active or the extent of his activity are entirely a matter of his own choice. The program is not directed toward management people alone, but rather embraces the bank's entire staff, which consists of approximately 14,000 employees, all in the white collar category, with varying economic and political beliefs and all levels of education, from high school to the highest specialized and professional degrees.

Initially the bank's Public Affairs Program was undertaken in three phases. The first was a one-hour seminar, held on bank time for groups of 50 to 60, designed to alert participants to the need for more effective citizenship. Participation was voluntary and practically all employees elected to participate. The program urged participants to register, vote, and work in their political parties.

Second was a one-day political workshop, held on bank time for groups of about 75 employees, designed for those who wished to learn more about the workings of our political system. About 2,000 members of the staff have chosen to participate.

The third and continuing follow-up phase was the counseling of employees on how they could go about becoming politically active in the party of their choice. The program was gradually expanded to include other activities.

The bank now offers a practical politics seminar, a series of five 2-hour sessions which get right down to the "nuts and bolts" of practical politics. The sessions are held once a week, one hour on bank time, one on employees' time, and have been attended by about 1,000 employees.

Public affairs bulletins, which discuss major political and economic issues, are published periodically for employees.

An economic reasoning course was introduced in 1962 to provide participants with a better understanding of the fundamentals and workings of our free economic system.

Each year, just before registration time, the bank holds a first voter rally and workshop for those employees eligible to vote for the first time. Films and talks by state officials are followed by practice on actual voting machines. A kit of material describing the requirements for registering and voting is handed out. There were 400 attendees at the last rally in 1965.

Drives to stimulate and assist staff members to contribute to their political parties are conducted each year, with careful provisions for anonymity.

Each year awards are made to employees who perform an outstanding service in political, civic, or government affairs. Any employee may nominate himself or any other staff member. About 10 or 12 awards are made each year, consisting of a scroll, a $200 Savings Bond, and an extra week of paid vacation.

Supplementing these various phases of the program is the bank's employee newspaper, which publicizes information on all matters of citizen interest.

Surveys conducted by the bank showed that more than 700 employees worked in the 1962 campaigns and over 1,000 worked for their parties and candidates in the 1964 campaigns. Almost 300 have run for elective office and about 150 are currently serving in town and county offices. Still others are doing volunteer work for their parties.

The bank feels that the cost of the program has been more than justified not only by what it has accomplished but also in terms of enabling it to fulfill its responsibilities as a good corporate citizen.

* * *

Participants had also received a description of the public affairs program of the Caterpillar Tractor Company, by Byron DeHaan, Public Affairs Manager. His paper, in shortened form, is as follows.

PROGRAM OF THE CATERPILLAR TRACTOR COMPANY

It appears that the great majority of managements have bought the premise that public affairs is a legitimate and necessary object of corporate enterprise. But still in droves, they are hesitating to start effective public affairs programs--or to expand modest beginnings already made--because they're not quite yet convinced how to do it organizationally. Or more significantly, because they are afraid the whole thing is going to cost a great deal of money, and may eventually *not* be worth the candle.

These doubts and hesitations and introspections are understandable and right. A public affairs program--like any other corporate program--must be oriented from the long-term vantage point toward the profitability of the corporation. If it is not so oriented, it will not last.

We've had a Public Affairs Department at Caterpillar for four years, consisting of two parts, Civic Affairs and Communications.

Our Civic Affairs people handle plant receptions and tours, community relationships, political and economic education--for which we use U. S. Chamber of Commerce courses on practical politics, freedom vs. communism, and the competitive enterprise economy--issues analysis, and legislative contact.

For the classes, employees are asked to contribute their free time, and pay half the cost of the course. In the past three years, 2300 employees have enrolled in one or another of the courses.

The legislative contact work seeks to involve influential managers as part-time lobbyists. A Public Affairs Bulletin is circulated to a limited list of about 85 people out of our total employment of 32,000. The Bulletin describes proposed legislation and its potential impact on Caterpillar, informs recipients of the need for particular legislation, and urges specific action.

Many corporate public affairs programs break down over the matter of issues. Company after company, many with a firm commitment to public affairs, will not take a public stand, for example, in their employee publications, on such subjects as state unemployment and workmen's compensation programs, school problems, Medicare, or state sales and franchise taxes. Corporations oughtn't to take stands on all issues, but on those which have a demonstrable relevancy to their own operations.

The Communications people take care of communicating the company's views to employees, through the bi-monthly magazine and bulletin boards, handle press relations, supply ads on economic topics for public and high school newspapers, and handle our weekly half-hour Peoria television show. Employees also receive letters from the company president on particular subjects, such as federal finances.

Companies can provide public affairs programs at no great cost by doing such things as using materials already available, using existing personnel to supervise, scheduling classes outside working hours and asking employees to part part of the cost, and making better use of existing channels of communication.

One proliferating flower of the public affairs business seems to be the newsletter or bulletin . . . often sent to thousands of salaried people in a corporation . . . usually studiously nonpartisan and diligent in expressing both sides of an issue . . . and urging you to make up your own mind. I submit the same type of information which is available in magazines and the daily press.

As I've indicated, we do have a bulletin at Caterpillar. But we direct it to a very limited list of people--only those who can *do something* with the information. We always express opinion in these bulletins, and urge specific action.

This new era of public affairs consciousness in business is bringing us a clearer view of the critical need to provide a better climate for the effective application of the free choice, free enterprise system. There is every indication such a better climate can be gradually secured--if we succeed in breeding understanding of the need for it among the citizenry of the country.

* * *

Professor Ivar E. Berg, of the Department of Business Administration, Columbia University, discussed conflicts over the civil liberties of employees which are generated by the facts of organization life in our society.

CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP PROGRAMS--SOME QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

Ivar Berg

The growth of corporate programs that seek to engage employee interest in and concern about liberties in general and their roles as citizens, specifically, raises a number of interesting and provocative questions. These arise from the character and content of most efforts, and have to do, on the one hand, with assumptions that appear to underly the programs and on the other with implications that flow from the assumptions.

In the following pages I would like to explore these assumptions in order that I may in the process isolate some precise avenues for systematic study. While one hardly needs much imagination to see the need for systematic investigations, we may move forward more quickly in our examination of programs if we stake out a few of the fundamental issues that only systematic study can clarify.

First, one wonders whether our rights and liberties ought to be seen entirely in a societal context or whether there are problems involving rights in liberties within the relationship of individuals to the organization and institutional settings within which people spend time. Most programs focus on the citizen in American society--his confrontations with governments at various levels appear to be at the heart of most training and educational efforts. This practice leads to some curious anomalies.

Thus there are companies that encourage citizens to take a stand on political issues, but also require corporate leaders to clear speeches and writings with the Corporation in advance of their public appearance. In Texas not long ago a high level executive wrote an article, for Look magazine in the wake of the assassination of John F. Kennedy, that was more than a little critical of Dallas. He pointed out that while he did not blame Dallas for the assassination, he felt that there was much in Dallas' political and social atmosphere that deserved comment and criticism.

His seniors, under the threat of a consumer boycott that affected some of its service station operators, felt compelled to insist upon a system of clearances for the future and the executive resigned in protest against such interference with his basic rights. Our sympathy may be tempered by the knowledge that he was readily able to find a new position, but this fact should not blind us to the problem such cases help delineate. It is all too easy to talk of liberties when such cases are ignored.

Second, one wonders whether the interests of corporations in liberties grow out of a sense of social obligation and community responsibility or out of self-interest. The answer gave rise to a related question having to do with the nature of the overlap between a corporation's self-interests and its own citizenship responsibilities. While this second issue may seem strange it grows out of the fact that corporations are in many respects citizens, due to the peculiar legal history that has accompanied the use of these economic organizations.

Programs appear, typically, to focus on the long-range need for concern with rights and liberties. The full implementation of liberties, however, is sometimes not in the long but the short run. This can make for some fairly serious problems that are only apparently unrelated to the problem of rights and liberties.

Consider that we have the problem, in the United States, of balancing corporate interests in such things as proprietory information with other interests. The problem is at the moment a lively one facing a large number of young American engineering and scientific personnel.

A corporation obviously has a serious and legitimate interest in the secrets to which employees gain access in the course of their work. An employee, meanwhile, may come to his employer with the news that he has been offered a better job in another company. The typical response, in cases that have come to the bar, has been, simply, that ". . . if you seek to leave this company to do the same work you do for us, we will seek an injunction against you."

The most notorious of these cases have involved a rubber company and a major chemical company. (In neither case, interestingly, did the employer seek to bargain with the employee with the objective of using the market mechanism to full advantage.)

The question must be raised as to whether we are moving quickly, in consideration of one set of rights, in the direction of the borderline beyond which lies involuntary servitude. The question is a timely one to whatever degree the employee has become highly specialized, since his employability is limited by the degree of his specialty, and to the degree to which the information over which he has control is crucial to his employer's economic opportunity and well-being.

One can hardly help but wonder, in situations such as this, whether corporations do not provoke serious problems of liberty even as they embarrass themselves by expending so much energy in defense of the virtues of the market place while so totally and effectually undermining this mechanism which has, according to tradition, so long and usefully helped preserve rights.

Third, we may ask whether civil liberties are so easily isolatable from the array of other rights that concern corporations? One of the most obvious, continuous and even legitimate preoccupation of managers is with management's rights. I suppose that, broadly defined, management's rights are closely related to traditional American liberties. Management's rights, after all, can be, have been, and continually are linked to the concept of private property, a concept that enjoys a significant and hallowed place in the theory underlying the design of a "democratic republic."

Most often, however, management's rights appear to be seen rather narrowly as the rights needed to maintain hierarchal relationships in complex industrial organizations that guarantee order and discipline in the work place--the order that safeguards efficiency. Now one wonders if the narrower view squares with the broader view, according to which both parties--that is, all citizens, including "corporate citizens"--have an interest in the same rights.

Numerous cases comes to mind. Consider the case of a young man working in an auto factory. He found himself more than just a little bit critical of President Truman's policy at the time we were pursuing and waging the war in Korea against the North Koreans and the Chinese Communists. An articulate critic, and an apparently well informed and well read critic, he was aggravating other employees in the shop--aggravating them to the point that tempers were beginning to boil over and there was an allegedly very serious prospect that production would be affected again, and again, and again. Someone complained to management and management took the position, which it felt was well within its rights and its obligation to order its work force, that this man should be discharged.

The man was discharged and the case, perhaps surprisingly, went to arbitration. And, perhaps, even more surprisingly, the discharge was upheld by one of America's leading labor arbitrators. There was no evidence brought forth in the case whatever, that any effort had been made to inform the employees in the work place that the offending worker had the right to talk. (I mention parenthetically that the man never stopped his own work while he was talking about the President and the war.) All the action was taken against the man who was exercising certain Constitutional rights. He lost his job experiencing what old-line unionists used to call "economic capital punishment."

Again, this took place in a company with a well developed program in American liberties, public affairs and all the rest. No one apparently considered that perhaps this man's rights could be protected, and production maintained and continued, by pointing out to people in the work place that they need not listen or take seriously what the man was saying. Again, fairly serious issues present themselves: there is an inconsistency, at the margins at least, between the commitments made in public affairs programs and the behavior manifest in the treatment of individuals.

In contrast with the previous case, this one involved a blue collar worker. The question is basically the same, however: what kind of participation and what kind of politics are we talking about when we say that we should encourage our employees to participate actively in politics? Is not the auto worker who is concerned about foreign policy issues, however unpopular his views, practicing participation in politics?

Fourth--are civil liberties to be seen in largely political terms, or are they to be seen imbedded in a wider context or a series of wider contexts? Are liberties to be seen only with reference to the citizen in his relation to the state? Or are we to see civil liberties as rooted in the matrix of relationships that determine a man's opportunities? The case, for example, of a steel executive comes to mind. He comes much closer to many of us than he does to the differentially situated factory worker. He happened to be a member of an Equal Opportunity Committee in Birmingham, Alabama. The case is familiar to readers of The New York Times, which gave the case a big play. The executive was laid off on the grounds that the reputation of the corporation apparently would suffer some significant disabilities in a community in which feelings about civil liberties and working rights at that particular juncture ran strong.

Again, one has a certain sympathy for the corporation caught in the multiple pressures of the civil rights revolution; the corporation does have to maintain some order in its work force. And it does have to be concerned with getting the steel out of the mill. At the same time, however, there is a reasonable question about just how much one has to be concerned about the damaged relationships and images of a corporation on the one hand, and the economic capital punishment of the individual whose reputation suffers and whose job opportunities suffer on the other. The company's historical effort to influence public policy is, with most corporations', easily documented. There is as a consequence no easy way to argue that employment policies and public opinion are beyond the company's ken and scope.

Fifth--is there a conflict of interest between a corporation as a person and the individual employee as a person? In the words of my colleague, Professor James Kuhn, we have stretched the skin of a flea to cover a box car in our history and in our Constitutional posture towards the corporation when we made it a legal person. One may conveniently date this legal taxidermy with the Dartmouth College Case of 1819, in which the Supreme Court developed a very inventive solution to the problem of integrating economic units into a democratic republic or a republican democracy. It was inventive and it has served an enormous number of purposes. The rights and privileges of the corporation under the law as a persona ficta have all kinds of justifications and they contribute to the effectiveness of our great corporations. But significant problems emerge when these two "individuals" meet each other as individuals.

--

A related case involved the president of the Chrysler Motor Company, Mr. Newburg. It developed that a number of Chrysler executives had more than modest interests in supplier corporations. Newburg was sacrificed, from all that can be gathered from detailed press studies, because of pressures put on the board by irate stockholders.

He was subsequently cleared by two distinguished law firms. The first law firm was one that regularly served Chrysler Motors; the second was former Governor Dewey's law firm. They found no (for lack of better language) "hanky-panky." They found no basic or systematic subversion of his obligations to the corporation by his holdings in the supplier corporations. But, unfortunately, his clearance appeared in the back pages of most metropolitan newspapers, while the accusations of the man's disloyalty to the corporation were splattered on page one of most American newspapers.

Now I suspect that we might have something less than compassion for a man who obviously had opportunities to seek other jobs. Mr. Newburg was a man, I gather, of some independent means. But a man's reputation is not easily reclaimed, and the issue ought not to be considered in monetary terms. It could have just as easily been someone with fewer claims to alternative job opportunities. The basic question bears more significantly on the matters of whether one's position in respect to rights is not to an important degree imbedded in one's occupational opportunity, and the structure within which those opportunities play themselves out.

One could go on raising these kinds of questions and illustrating them with cases in point, but the point is perfectly clear. The answers to the questions, however, are not so clear to all. My illustrations may well imply some tentative answers, but I am more concerned that these words provoke an interest in and support for much more systematic study of the relationships, positions and questions involved in the materials here outlined. The same questions could be and have been raised about unions and their programs. Thus we may remind ourselves of the well known, and well documented case involving the Machinists Union, in which Union leaders used their not inconsiderable power to eliminate political opponents while the Union made pious claims to supporting rights and liberties.

My task, however, has been to address myself to the problems in the corporate setting and I suggest that much more is at stake than the nature and quality of public affairs programs. I think the cue we had here a minute ago from the distinguished gentlemen who have described corporate programs is that one of the problems is the contents of the programs presented by corporations.

I suggest that perhaps the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties has a significant function to serve. It may develop into a logical agency, or a logical means, for collecting data on the conceptions of civil liberties in corporations and the conceptions of liberties in America and for reaching out for answers to the questions extant programs have suggested to me. I am pleased to be identified with the Center as a member of its Board of Governors.

I think all of us could agree, in the leisure of conferences, that there are more desirable ways of conceptionalizing and defining civil liberties than would appear to be implicit from the cases I have reviewed. I think that we could also agree that the preservation of civil liberties is significantly related to the preservation of other valued arrangements, not the least of which might be the market system.

I implied in one of the cases, involving employees with proprietory information, that the market system was a very valuable device historically, for protecting people's individual liberties. I am not so sure that in undermining the market system by occasionally ill-advised maneuvers corporations do not undermine the liberties that the market system,to which such rhetorical homage is paid, was historically calculated to guarantee.

* * *

The Saturday afternoon session, chaired by Professor Aaron W. Warner of the Economics Department, Columbia University, covered "Citizenship and Public Affairs Education in Unions." Harry Fleischman, Director of the National Labor Service, American Jewish Committee, presented the overview paper.

UNION EDUCATION AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

Harry Fleischman

A cartoon in the New Yorker showed a wife complaining to her bearded artist-husband, "Why do you have to be a non-conformist like everybody else?"

Would that it were so. Unfortunately, non-conformity is still viewed by the American people as a dangerous disease to be shunned like the plague.

A Purdue University poll of teen-age opinions revealed that more than half of our high school students believe that wiretapping and the third degree should be legalized to help the police maintain obedience and that police should censor books, movies, radio and TV to shield us from improper thinking. Moreover, 41 per cent would abolish freedom of the press and 33 per cent would deny freedom of speech to people who hold unpopular views.

Nor can we turn for defense of free speech to our temples of learning. Two professors who polled a "random sample" of University of Wisconsin students found that the students "overwhelmingly rejected the principles of the Bill of Rights"--the right to freedom of press, assembly and worship. Indeed, Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court said several years ago that he doubted the Bill of Rights would win approval if it were submitted to this generation of Americans in a referendum.

Businessmen follow along in the accustomed pattern. Gallup and Roper polls commissioned by the Fund for the Republic a decade ago disclosed that a third of college-educated businessmen would ban a person who favors government ownership of big industry from teaching in a college. Where businessmen had less than college education, 58 per cent would ban such a teacher.

An example of business views was a pamphlet, "So You Want a Better Job?" by Paul W. Boynton, a personnel officer of Socony Vacuum Oil Company, which included this passage:

> Personal views can cause a lot of trouble. Remember then to keep them always conservative. The "isms" are out. Business being what it is, it naturally looks with disfavor on the wild-eyed radical or even the moderate pink.

When Socialist leader Norman Thomas wrote to the company, Boynton came to see him but couldn't understand why Thomas was exercised. After all, 300,000 copies of his pamphlet had been circulated for years, and Thomas' was the first word of criticism that had reached him.

Happily, after a short time, C. F. Beatty, Socony's industrial relations director, wrote Thomas that the pamphlet had been revised to proclaim that "the world needs different viewpoints; blind conformity means stagnation. You won't get far unless you think for yourself."

Unfortunately, Norman Thomases are rare. How strong is the current pressure for conformity in the business world today?

With high school and college students, to say nothing of businessmen, so fearful of dissent, should we expect more of the labor movement? Ideally we should, since organized labor learned the need for civil liberties the hard way. As early as 1806, when Philadelphia shoemakers went on strike, they were brought to trial and found guilty for forming "a combination and conspiracy to raise their wages." In 1894, in the Pullman strike, a labor injunction--termed by union leader Eugene V. Debs a "Gatling gun on paper"--helped crush the strike and smash the American Railway Union. Lockouts, blacklists, yellow-dog contracts, labor spies to undermine and betray unions and the use of troops and deputized thugs to terrorize workers and organizers were all parts of the employer arsenal in the past.

Even today, as a recent convention of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations pointed out, "Freedom of speech, assembly, association and solicitation of membership for union organizers and factory workers are virtually non-existent in the rural South and all efforts to exercise these rights have been and are being frustrated, despite the guarantees of the Constitution." In 1965, organizer Henry Jenkins of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union received death threats just before a National Labor Relations Board election in Greensboro, Alabama. In 1961, two organizers of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers were brutally beaten by hoodlums in Ellijay, Georgia, and then arrested for "fighting,' disorderly conduct, inciting a riot and soliciting membership without a license." A union organizer was beaten and kidnapped by a mob in Franklinton, N.C., while the city police and the county sheriff turned their backs. When two organizers of the Textile Workers Union were knifed in Fitzgerald, Georgia, police blandly wrote off this incident with a report that they got into a fight and knifed each other.

The right to dissent, to hold unpopular views, to try to convince others and change existing practices by peaceful and lawful means is the very cornerstone of American liberty. As Labor, the paper of the railway brotherhoods, eloquently said:

> Our forefathers fought a bloody seven-year revolution to insure these rights and bequeath them to their descendants . . . What distinguishes an American from the citizen of a Communist land or from the subjects of any other tyrant is not chiefly the American's standard of living. It's that we are more nearly free men. And the Bill of Rights is what protects our freedom.

Yet, while every AFL-CIO convention has unanimously passed strong resolutions in defense of civil liberties, there is a wide gap between the positions voted at conventions and the views of local union leaders. Rank and file unionists score even lower in concern for civil liberties.

Back in 1954, the Fund for the Republic polled 5,000 rank and file Americans and 1,500 community leaders on their attitudes toward communists and civil liberties. The survey's results, summarized by Harvard Professor Samuel A. Stouffer in a fact-packed book, "Communists, Conformity and Civil Liberties," included data on 1,537 rank and file unionists and 107 presidents of local unions.

The following year, Ben Segal, then with the Trade Union Program of the Fund for the Republic, and I conducted polls of local union leaders at union leadership training institutes. Union educational directors joined in. The answers to our institute quizzes, covering 1,301 local union heads at more than a score of institutes from 1955 to 1964, were remarkably similar to those listed by Stouffer. They disclosed that union members' enthusiasm for the traditional American principles embodied in the Bill of Rights, their tolerance of people whose ideas and opinions differed from their own, were lukewarm at best.

What do we mean by "tolerance?" Not necessarily approval. We mean that, even if we disagree strongly with other people's opinions, we uphold their rights of free expression, the civil liberties guaranteed to them by the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

President George Meany of the AFL-CIO stresses that "one need not accept the doctrines of democratic socialism to realize that its adherents are true democrats who are uncompromising enemies of communism and all other forms of dictatorship. As a matter of fact, democratic socialists have often shared with free trade unionists the honor of being the first and main target of communist hostility, abuse, persecution and liquidation." Yet two out of five local union leaders would bar a socialist from teaching and one out of five would expel a socialist from his local union.

Although the Bill of Rights declares that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, more than half of our local union leaders would deny an atheist the right to teach and one out of four would keep him out of the union.

As to communists, two out of three local union leaders would strip American-born communists of their American citizenship, while five out of six would fire a communist working in a defense plant. Almost half would fire a communist who clerked in a store.

During the McCarthy era, labor was fearful of the witchhunts which spread throughout the land. Unions are not opposed to investigations per se. They hailed the LaFollette probe into labor spying, but AFL-CIO spokesmen have criticized "loosely-conducted congressional investigations where unfounded accusations and unproved charges had the effect of character assassination of good, loyal Americans." Such inquiries were criticized as wandering from any proper legislative purpose into attempts "to enforce uniformity of opinions and to stifle the traditional American right to dissent." Yet two thirds of local union leaders polled backed the McCarthyite notion that Congress should investigate political beliefs and associations in order to determine whether they are "un-American."

How is it that such a wide gap exists between the views of top union spokesmen and those of local leaders and rank and filers? What kind of union education is there on civil liberties, civil rights, public affairs and voter participation? Has union education failed to contribute effectively to union members' understanding of American liberties?

Perhaps we can best answer these questions by examining the nature, scope and function of labor education. First of all, we must realize that the raw material for union education--workers in mines, mills, factories and offices--comes out of our primary and secondary school systems with woefully inadequate teaching about civil liberties and the primary place it should hold in our American way of life. The reasons for this are being dealt with in other papers before this conference, so I will not attempt to enumerate their causes.

Second, we must recognize that labor education on the formal level--classes, institutes, conferences--reaches only a very small proportion of union members. For all practical intents and purposes, labor education is leadership training. It is directed at shop stewards, committeemen, shop chairmen and paid union officials such as organizers and business agents. It tends to focus on practical training rather than general education, concentrating on such subjects as steward and officer training, collective bargaining, public speaking, union structure and administration. In the broader subjects, as Lawrence Rogin, AFL-CIO education director, has pointed out, the study of economics starts out with unemployment and wages, and political science with the need for passage of a minimum wage law or a Wagner Act. That education which has been most successful starts with the immediate problems of the workers and builds upon them. In many cases, he concedes, the training is conceived narrowly and becomes self-defeating, limited only to training.

Where, instead, the educator builds upon the immediate problems to take the student to an exploration of the broad principle, the theoretical concept, he can help develop the ability of "learning how to learn" which Jack London once described as the characteristic of the liberally educated individual.

Thus, suggests Rogin, the problem of legislative reapportionment can open the way to an analysis of the concept of democracy. The pressures of Negroes for jobs and housing creates immediate problems for unions to consider, plus the possibility of understanding history, anthropology, psychology and sociology.

The AFL-CIO Education Department conducts no schools or classes under its own direct sponsorship. It assists, guides and inspires those international unions and state and local labor bodies which do carry on educational activity. It prepares teaching materials, conducts professional conferences for labor educators, and urges unions without educational programs to venture into the field. It maintains the major labor film library in the United States, which contains many films dealing with civil liberties and rights. It encourages the development of university labor education centers and assists in promoting effective cooperation between them and the unions.

In preparation for this paper, we wrote the nation's union educational directors and university labor specialists to find out what kind of education union members were receiving in civil liberties, civil rights and citizenship participation. We received almost forty replies, with extensive samples of programs developed. In addition, Mrs. Judy Marine, research assistant at the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, interviewed many education directors in Washington and New York. The results of those inquiries will be compiled and passed along to you following this conference.[1] Broadly speaking, they indicated that of the more than 130 national and international unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO, only about 40 have staff in the national office charged with the specific responsibility of developing educational programs. Most of the larger unions, covering approximately half the AFL-CIO membership, are in this number. Many large unions also have regional education directors throughout the country. Frequently they carry on massive programs, including the development of special materials and the constant involvement of their local unions in a variety of educational activities. Even where education is ignored or frowned upon by the national offices of some unions, many of their local and regional organizations carry on extensive educational programs.

---

[1] These results appear in Appendix B of this Report.

The most prominent union educational activity is the one-week resident labor school, usually sponsored by a national union, but some also by state federations. Approximately 150 to 200 such schools are held each summer, with 10,000 to 15,000 students. Most of them meet on university campuses and are held in cooperation with university labor education centers, but others take place at summer camps, hotels and other conference centers, including a few owned by unions.

About 50,000 trade unionists participate in weekend educational conferences, also of an intensive nature. These are primarily sponsored by individual unions, but many involve a number of unions. The programs of weekend conferences range the gamut of union concerns--the "tool" subjects, plus economic, social, political and international problems.

In recent years, training of full-time union personnel in longer resident programs has been growing, with much experimentation to find the most effective methods and content for this activity.

Many university labor programs and local unions also carry on a variety of classes held in the evening or at other times workers can attend without taking time off from work. These classes generally meet once a week, with most lasting from six to ten weeks. In one recent year, universities reported conducting almost 450 such courses, with about 12,000 students. This does not include the large number of classes run by unions on their own. But, at most, only 100,000 unionists attend any classes--15,000,000 union members remain without any formal union education.

What subjects are the students given? One area of concentration is concerned with the "tool" subjects, union administration, shop steward training, collective bargaining, arbitration procedures, communication and related subjects. Another seeks to develop effective union citizenship, teaching labor history and an understanding of the role of the union in industry and society. A third area deals with labor legislation in all its aspects. More and more attention is being given to the political role of unions, and their broad legislative objectives, with courses in economics, civil rights, reapportionment, the threat to democracy posed by the ultra-right, political science and international affairs. Unions are increasingly concerned lest their gains at the bargaining table be lost in the halls of Congress and state legislatures. Finally, especially in the long-term schools, there is an attemot to provide an understanding of the total society, with a concentration on the social sciences, but with some attention to the humanities as well.

Are unions democratic? By and large they are, especially in the locals. They are far more democratic, by their very nature, than business organizations which are run on a hierarchical principle. Now, more than in the past, there is acceptance of dissent and some knowledge of the traditional methods of democracy. To some extent this is due to the internal democracy provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act, which eliminated some of the grosser aspects of union autocracy, i.e., no elections, dictatorial control, expulsion of opposition members, which prevailed in a few unions.

Democracy does not mean that decisions are always wise or progressive. In some craft unions, when union officers urged their locals to accept Negro members, the members democratically threw out their officers. It is interesting to note that many business critics of unions, who protest "boss rule" in unions, at the same time are unhappy when rank and file workers vote to reject contracts union leaders have accepted. Then the cry becomes, "what kind of leaders are you when you can't even control your rank and file?"

One factor that induces unions to promote teaching about civil rights and civil liberties is the need to promote unionization in difficult situations. Thus, attempts by textile workers and other unions in the South to organize have been met by ordinances requiring organizers to pay license fees up to $2,500; meeting places have suddenly become unavailable; local papers and radio stations carry only anti-union messages; race-hate and allegedly anti-Communist propaganda smears the unions; police and vigilante brutality break out. Therefore, unions had to teach about the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. In doing so, unions found themselves having to teach that the same rights apply in situations some unions would prefer to ignore--such as civil rights. When school desegregation was a hot issue in the South, and many union members opposed such integration, some union educators used an indirect approach to deal with the issue. They would focus on the right to picket, but give illustrations that would parallel experiences on school desegregation. For instance, Bill Elkuss of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers used this theoretical case:

> The South Carolina legislature outlaws picketing. An employer decides this is a good time to destroy the union. He cuts wages, eliminates paid holidays and vacations. What would you do?
>
> SOUTHERN UNIONISTS: We'd go on strike and carry picket signs.
>
> EDUCATOR: Suppose the Governor calls out the National Guard, not to enforce the First Amendment on free speech, but to stop your picketing.
>
> SOUTHERN UNIONISTS: We'd go to court--all the way to the Supreme Court, if necessary.

> **EDUCATOR:** Okay, the court rules you have the right to picket peacefully and enjoins the Governor from using the National Guard to stop your picketing. But a "Citizens' Council to Stop Picketing" comes to the plant gates, shouts "Kill those dirty Communists," and throws bricks and stones until you fall. If you were President of the United States, what would you do?
>
> **SOUTHERN UNIONISTS:** Issue a Presidential Proclamation calling on the mob to disperse and ordering the Governor to enforce the law.
>
> **EDUCATOR:** What if the mob and the Governor pay no attention to the Proclamation and continue to beat up union pickets?
>
> **SOUTHERN UNIONISTS:** Only one thing to do. Federalize the National Guard or call out the troops.

In this case, union students who were segregationists were led by the logic of the situation to conclusions they would have bitterly resented before dealing with this case study.

In the 1950 Senatorial primary in North Carolina, Frank Graham received 90 per cent of the Negro votes. The fact was the major issue in the run-off. The unionized mill villages stayed with Graham, while the non-union ones voted on the basis of race. The result indicated the effects of intensive union education. Education didn't eliminate prejudice, but it enabled even segregationist workers to put the race question into some kind of perspective, balancing it with other issues favored by the candidates.

Where unions support civil rights, they find that they must carry on a good deal of education in the South to carry their members along with them. And now that the spirit and elan of the civil rights movement in the past few years has provided a shining example to the labor movement, unions are increasingly playing up the theme of a Negro-labor-liberal coalition in their organizing efforts in the South. The International Chemical Workers Union, which had a number of segregated locals only a few years ago, has made a movie, "Union and Freedom," telling of the victorious strike against the Scripto Company in Atlanta. It shows Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., speaking at strike meetings and marching with union President Walter L. Mitchell on the picket line.

Southern unions sponsor an annual month-long Southern Labor Training Center for full-time staff plus a number of week-long institutes which stress the same coalition concept.

Civil liberties situations which led unions to attempt to educate their members include the industrial security problem. A number of years ago, the AFL-CIO sponsored a pamphlet on "Security, Civil

Liberties and Unions," and many conferences on the subject took place. Labor's vigorous activity against abuses in the various government security programs was reflected in our poll, which showed nine out of ten local union leaders supporting the right of those accused as security risks to confront and cross-examine their accusers. It was not until 1960 that the Supreme Court held the government's industrial security program invalid in an 8-to-1 decision because denial of confrontation and cross-examination of government witnesses, without statutory authority, was illegal.

The AFL-CIO and its affiliates, recognizing that wiretapping constitutes a serious threat to personal liberties and that technological developments have made it very difficult to control, has urged a law permitting wiretaps only to federal agents under specific court orders, in an area clearly defined to cover espionage, treason and kidnapping. All other taps should be banned, said the AFL-CIO, including a prohibition on using tapped information at congressional hearings. Fittingly, the Communications Workers of America has led the fight against wiretapping.

The use of so-called "lie detectors," says the AFL-CIO, violates basic considerations of human dignity, raises issues of invasion of privacy, self-incrimination, and implies the concept of guilty until proven innocent. Therefore it is waging a broad campaign for federal action to ban the use of such devices by both private employers and government, and the issue comes up at many union schools and in union papers.

Seven unions and a farmers' group have joined the American Civil Liberties Union is challenging the constitutionality of the non-communist affidavit provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. The oath was attacked as a bill of attainder (legislative punishment without judicial trial) prohibited by Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution.

The brief was filed in support of leaders of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers who were convicted of falsely denying affiliation with the Communist Party. Section 9(h) of the Taft-Hartley Act barred access to NLRB services to organizations failing to file such affidavits. The petition was backed by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the Meat Cutters, Teachers, Typographers, Transport Workers, Auto Workers, Packinghouse Workers and the National Farmers Union.

The brief says that the groups are especially interested in the case "because (we) are opposed to government-imposed loyalty tests... as a prerequisite for holding office...in a private organization. (We) are opposed in particular to such tests as a condition for the receipt of a benefit otherwise made freely available by statute."

Noting that the Mine-Mill Union was expelled from the CIO in 1949 because it was found to be dominated by the Communist Party, the brief contrasted that action by a private association with governmental compulsion that the Taft-Hartley Act's affidavit represents.

One important area where most unions have been discouraging, rather than encouraging, the right to dissent deals with the war in Vietnam. The official position of the AFL-CIO strongly backs the Administration's position on that war and union papers and educational programs reflect that policy, with very few exceptions. District 65, RWDSU, did carry on open debate at special membership meetings and printed the debate in its paper, but that educational effort is almost unique. There are a handful of other unions permitting debate on the issue, such as the American Federation of Teachers, but most have made it a sacred cow. True, the AFL-CIO sponsors the daily broadcasts of Edward P. Morgan over the American Broadcasting Company Network, despite his frequently critical comments, but I am afraid that that is the exception that proves the rule.

Since only 100,000 unionists attend union classes or institutes, what kind of education do rank and file members receive from their unions? The one man line of communication which reaches all union members is the union journal. Yet in many cases the union paper is narrowly parochial with its main stress on bread and butter issues. While most such papers rarely deal with civil liberties, the coverage of civil rights issues in recent years has risen markedly.

Educational and citizenship themes are often discussed at local union meetings, but unfortunately such meetings are infrequently well-attended unless contract negotiations or a strike vote are on the agenda.

At the same time, because unions are vitally interested in legislation, increasing emphasis has been placed on political education and COPE (Committee on Political Education) has engaged in vigorous voter registration drives and distribution of simple educational material. This has reached far more rank and file union members than union educational departments.

In addition, the AFL-CIO Community Services Department has trained 75,000 union counselors, ready to lend a hand when a worker gets into financial trouble, steer unionists to appropriate social agencies when they run into difficulties, help on welfare and mental health problems, and serve on boards of many community agencies. In a broad sense, both COPE and the Community Services Department are engaged in union education for better citizenship.

Nevertheless, civil liberties remains an abstraction for most local union leaders and rank and file unionists' zeal for civil liberties is depressingly low. Is the prospect of educating unionists in civil liberties less then a hopeless one?

Far from it. We mentioned the questionnaire we distributed at union summer schools brought discouragingly negative responses, but we didn't reveal the whole story. We distributed the attached questionnaire at the opening institute session. Local union leaders filled them out immediately--without any discussion. We told the participants not to sign their names and emphasized that this was an opinion poll, not a test. After the questionnaires were handed in, we kept the results secret until the closing session of the institute, so that knowledge of the results would not color classroom discussion.

In class the next day, we asked the students to define democracy. Invariably, and usually without much prodding, the answers--which we put on the blackboard--included:

- Freedom of Speech
- Freedom of Press
- Freedom of Worship
- Freedom of Assembly
- Majority Rule with Protection of the Rights of the Minority.

Then, as we asked for discussion on the specific questions, a fascinating process started. In dealing with subjects like collective bargaining, labor economics, political issues and civil rights, a good many of the local union leaders are aware of and accept the union viewpoint, but civil liberties is virgin territory for most of them. Thus, prior to discussion, the questionnaires revealed that two out of five would keep a Socialist from teaching.

We called on students who backed each side of the issue to explain why. "I don't want a Socialist giving my kids propaganda about socialism in class," said one. (We had to lay down ground rules and explain that any teacher who propagandized for any point of view was not teaching--he was indoctrinating. The purpose of teaching, we continued, was not only to present facts to students but lead them to think for themselves about the meaning of those facts. For the sake of our discussion, we added, we had to assume that the teacher was following the approved curriculum, or else he could be fired for not doing his job.)

"I still don't want a Socialist as a teacher. He's opposed to our economic system, and if he's a good teacher, he will have influence on the children, even outside the classroom." Back we went to the blackboard. How did this answer square with the definition of democracy he had previously approved? Brows were furrowed.

The same process, only more so, occurred when it came to atheism. Some stressed that if the atheist was a good teacher and a man of impeccable morals, he would be even more "dangerous," because then his example would be more attractive to the children. Most, however, despite strong personal misgivings, expressed the view that freedom of speech required protecting the rights even of an atheist. Some, backing that view, pointed out that the Bill of Rights declares that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

What about Communists? "They're enemies of our country. Why let them use our freedoms to destroy freedom?" "They tried to bust our union before. We won't give them another chance." "Yes," replied another, "but what good is freedom of speech if we allow it only to people with whom we agree? Unless those whose views are obnoxious are free to speak, freedom is a fiction." The arguments waxed hot and heavy--never completely resolved, but certainly with much greater thought given to the complexities of the problem.

When almost half said they would fire a Communist who clerked in a store, the question arose, "Should Communists have the right to eat?" Almost all said yes, and then puzzled out their replies when asked, "If you would deny a job as a store clerk, what jobs should a Communist be allowed to hold? Or should he just be on relief, with our taxes supporting him?"

When two-thirds of the local union leaders voted to strip American-born Communists of their citizenship, we asked what did the Constitution provide on revoking citizenship for native Americans. They were usually flabbergasted to learn that citizenship can be revoked only for treason against the United States, which consists "only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort" and that "no person shall be convicted of treason unless on testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or on confession in open court."

We applied similar Socratic dialogues to each item on the questionnaire, to the accompaniment of pained expressions, heated debate and eventual enlightenment. One union staffer put it this way, "You're really unfair. You're making us think!"

This technique, of course, is not the only successful way to teach unionists about civil liberties. But it demonstrated that open, informed discussion on the issues invariably made support for civil liberties soar dramatically.

If civil liberties views can be reversed so easily, suggest some observers, we need not fear the anti-civil liberty attitudes of most Americans. They're only skin-deep. That's correct, but only if we can provide effective civil liberties education for all Americans. Today, neither the school system, corporate programs or union education is doing an adequate job. We need not only to develop additional materials and techniques but also to place civil liberties higher on our list of priorities.

Writing on "Strengthening Union Democracy" in the American Federationist some years ago, Jack Barbash of the University of Wisconsin noted that "the democratic process is of the essence of union functioning because if the union is not an instrument of interest representation it is nothing. The union's ability to represent its constituents has been and is its chief stock in trade in a way that is not true of any other private association. A failure of the union to function democratically is therefore a failure in its central function."

To give vitality to democracy in the union within the framework of union goals, suggested Barbash, "the union leadership must first act out of conviction that democracy is worthwhile even if it is occasionally inconvenient. And secondly, union leadership must communicate to the membership an awareness and sensitivity to the responsibilities and the occasional inconveniences involved in the exercise of democratic rights."

How can this be done? In addition to the use of civil liberties questionnaires as a basis for discussion courses, many other approaches are possible. In 1962, for instance, the National Institute of Labor Education published a pamphlet on "Teaching Ethics in Labor Education" which included case materials, a bibliography, and ways of adapting the case method to labor ethics education. That project was financed by the Fund for Adult Education.

Certainly today it ought to be possible to secure the financial support needed to prepare a pamphlet which could bring together under one cover a wide variety of methods and materials on teaching civil liberties. The pamphlet might well include:

1. Purposes and goals in teaching civil liberties.

2. Ways in which civil liberties concerns can be salted into traditional labor subjects, such as steward training, grievance procedure, collective bargaining, organizing, public speaking, etc.

3. Ways of teaching specific aspects of civil liberties--due process of law, free speech, right of assembly, etc.

4. One shot sessions for summer schools and institutes that would emphasize civil liberties.

5. Case studies in a union setting designed to stimulate discussion of alternate approaches on the theme of "how would you handle this situation?"

6. Selected list of films and pamphlets useful in teaching civil liberties.

7. Resources for teaching civil liberties. Descriptions of government and private agencies, universities and unions experienced in this field and types of persons they have available.

8. Brief reading excerpts from great historic figures associated with the idea of democracy.

9. The Democratic Practices Code of the AFL-CIO Committee on Ethical Practices.

10. Obstacles to look for when teaching about civil liberties and how to overcome them.

It should not be assumed that having materials available will automatically assure their full use. Training or demonstration programs may need to be developed, and conferences held to bring the full range of trade union education to bear on this subject.

At best, however, we must remember that trade union education reaches but a fraction of union members. We need to supplement this education with a constant flood of materials in the public schools, in corporate programs, in the daily press, magazines, radio and TV. Only such a massive educational development can create the climate and soil in which full democracy can flower.

* * *

TWENTY QUESTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

NOTE TO UNION MEMBERS: Please fill out carefully. Many union members disagree on the correct answers to the questions below. All we are looking for is your opinion. PLEASE DON'T SIGN YOUR NAME.

Put a circle around Y (for Yes) if you agree with a statement below; if you do not agree, circle N (for No).

1. Should a man who favors government ownership of the railroads and big industry
   - (a) be allowed to teach? Y N
   - (b) be expelled if he is a member of your union? Y N
2. Should an atheist (a man who doesn't believe in the existence of God)
   - (a) be allowed to teach? Y N
   - (b) be expelled if he is a member of your union? Y N
3. Should an admitted Communist
   - (a) be allowed to teach? Y N
   - (b) be expelled if he is a member of your union? Y N
   - (c) be fired if he works in a defense plant? Y N
   - (d) be fired if he is a clerk in a store? Y N
4. Should an American-born admitted Communist have his citizenship taken from him? Y N
5. Should admitted Communists be jailed? Y N
6. Is it more important to identify all the Communists even if some innocent people should be hurt, than to protect the innocent even if some Communists are not found out? Y N
7. Should those accused as security risks under federal security programs have the right to confront and cross-examine their accusers? Y N
8. Should Government security tests be confined only to sensitive positions involving military, atomic, government or international affairs and not be required for other positions? Y N

9. Is everyone who invokes the privilege against self-incrimination guilty as suspected? Y N

10. Should Congress investigate political beliefs and associations in order to determine whether they are "un-American?" Y N

11. Should employers be permitted to state their views regarding labor unions to their workers? Y N

12. Are people born with prejudices just the way they are born with instinctive reactions to heat, hunger, and loud noises? Y N

13. Should a union member who joins a White Citizens' Council or the Ku Klux Klan be expelled from the Union? Y N

14. Should all children, no matter what their race or religion, be allowed to go to the same public schools? Y N

15. Are universities justified in using a quota system to limit admission of members of certain racial and religious groups? Y N

16. If a Negro were to become your neighbor, would you

    (a) try to find another place to live? Y N

    (b) welcome him? Y N

    (c) join a committee to urge him to move? Y N

    (d) do nothing? Y N

17. Should trade unions be entitled to restrict their membership on the basis of color, religion, or national origin? Y N

18. Should unions put anti-discrimination clauses in all their collective bargaining contracts? Y N

19. Should unions enforce equal opportunity for all, regardless of race or religion, in respect to apprenticeship training and job promotions? Y N

20. If the employer in your industry hires no Negroes, should your union try to make him change his policy? Y N

(Distributed by National Labor Service, 165 East 56th Street, New York, N.Y.)

4/14/61

Harry Van Arsdale, President of the New York City Central Labor Council and Business Manager of Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, described his union's program, and then commented on the need to organize unorganized workers, such as the agricultural workers, in order to bring them in touch with the kind of education and sense of dignity which are part of full citizenship.

* * *

Carl Schlesinger, Education Director of Local 6 of the International Typographical Union and Secretary of the New York City Central Labor Council's Education Committee, described how the Central Labor Council's educational programs have utilized community resources, such as libraries, colleges and schools, and how the Council has been instrumental in helping local unions initiate their own programs.

* * *

William Abbott, Education Director of the United Rubber Workers of America, spoke briefly about his paper on the URW's program, which follows.

The Rubber Workers Union was born of dissent. In 1934 Akron General Tire workers invented the guerilla tactic of the sit-down strike; in 1936 Goodyear workers faced the guns of police and nearly overwhelming odds to win the first major triumph of the CIO. They dissented against the economic status quo, against the power structure, against the dominant value system of the society, and during the founding convention in 1935 when the President of the AFL said he was going to name the officers of the union, the delegates voted him down and dissented against the labor establishment.

If the nature of the union is to go on being one of social protest and dissent, then education must foster the dissent tradition.

This isn't easy. Young union members leave the schools and come into the factories almost totally ignorant of the tradition of American dissent and usually intolerant of opinions not identical to their own.

In a civil liberties study we made of 100 union leaders from 15 states, thirty-six per cent said they didn't want Republicans teaching their children social studies and sixty-five per cent said they didn't want socialists teaching social sciences. But the same study showed that the unionists who had been active for years and had also participated in URW schools and conferences scored high in civil liberties attitudes.

While one goal of the program is that of maintaining the tradition of protest and dissent, another is that of building group solidarity and a free spirit of democracy and equality. The chief union problem today is making the union meaningful to the new union member and developing new, democratic leadership. Strength and power impress workers, while democracy as a value lags.

Of course, another goal of the program is one of training people how to be better stewards and officers, how to run meetings and speak in public, how to administer a union, and improve a contract. Such training is essential for democratic leadership.

To achieve these goals the URW Education Program is divided into two parts.

First, there is the general education program, which consists of seven week-long summer schools, week-end conferences, and local union training programs. We have a two-man staff to cover the U.S. and Canada. We frequently use our Fair Practices Director plus the specialized knowledge of staff technicians when the occasion calls for it.

Instead of compulsory evenings of class work at our summer schools, we have voluntary sessions run by the students, guided by the staff. These sessions are better attended because the students feel it is their session. The atmosphere is informal, and racial integration is taken for granted. We never had success in hard-sell classes on racial discrimination, so we dropped them. Now we put Negroes in authority roles as teachers, we build an atmosphere of amiable equality, and we discuss the issues with everybody participating. We do get in some factual lessons on different races and cultures and the harm of race prejudice in the world affairs classes which are compulsory in all the summer schools.

General subject matter includes workshops on tool subjects and sessions on American government and politics, world affairs, social issues, labor history, and goals of labor. Teaching is done by discussion and by lecturing with visual aids.

The International pays "scholarships" to the local unions--room and board for a week for two persons from locals of under 1,000 members and three persons from locals of over 1,000. About 500 union leaders attend these schools every summer. The International and local unions spend approximately $100,000 a year on summer schools alone.

As a labor educator my values are at variance with the large marjority of union officials and even many of my education colleagues. The prevailing view of labor education is that the imparting of technical information to union leaders is of primary importance. Classes on pensions, insurance, unemployment benefits, contract analysis are those considered most important. But to feel a part of the movement and feel that the movement becomes a part of you is something time study or grievance handling can't teach. The primary aim of labor education should not be one of technical training, but of introducing stimulating ideas, making people think for themselves, and giving them a sense of their own history of struggle for social justice and human values.

Second, there is the legislative education program. We have three 5-day institutes in Washington, D.C. each year. We pay the travel expenses of one person per local union per year, and the cost of a tour of the city. Groups range from 45 to 60 persons.

Students attend Congressional hearings, visit Congressmen, the Supreme Court, Senate debates, the White House. The AFL-CIO Education Department sends a specialist to discuss issues like aid to education, or the war on poverty. After one hour of class instruction the students are off on visits, under staff supervision. One-half day is spent at the AFL-CIO talking to labor lobbyists, learning how the AFL-CIO operates as a legislative institution. The last day we have a "think" session, discussing the significance of what students have seen.

For the future, a broad-scale cooperative program is needed. The more reflective union leaders feel that something is missing in political education. "Issues" like Medicare, aid to education, labor legislation and beating the Right Wing over the head no longer seem to satisfy. What about the basics like power structures, the welfare and warfare state, economic and social planning, organizing the dispossessed to fight for themselves, the right to dissent, the right to be equal?

Meaningful social philosophies must be based upon a sense of history. Where is the history of social dissent? Needed is a center to promote the study of the history of the American worker, ethnic minorities, the tradition of social change and the development of our freedoms.

* * *

Participants had also received a description of the education program of the United Auto Workers of America by Brendan Sexton, Director of the UAW Leadership Studies Center, who was unable to attend at the last minute because of illness. His paper, in shortened form, is as follows:

Trade union education is a growing activity, but probably not more than 25 of the 125 trade unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO show any serious interest in union education. The 36 staff members of the UAW who work in its Education Department and Studies Center comprise nearly one-third of the total number employed in such work by all internationals.

Although real growth has occurred only during the last two decades, labor education as a movement is more than a century old, tracing back to the beginnings of the American Socialist Party. Earliest efforts were basically ideological--more concerned with convincing workers of the need for social change than with helping them build effective economic organizations. Modern union education emphasizes "tool subjects," designed to equip leaders to function effectively.

The UAW follows this trend, laying great stress on shop steward training, local union administration, parliamentary procedure, time study analysis, and collective bargaining. This development is related to the need in large industrial plants for shop stewards to be well trained in such things as evaluating workers' complaints, whether about violations of complex contracts or about "speed-up," negotiating with employers, and advising workers about union, company, and governmental benefits available to them, since there is no one but the steward to protect workers in the plant. There is no opportunity for direct contact between workers and employers, as there is in small shops, and this increases the workers' need for a knowledgeable, effective steward.

The UAW education effort did not really begin to sink roots until 1946, when Victor Reuther became director, although since 1937, locals have been required by the union constitution to set aside three cents from each monthly dues payment for education, with the international appropriating a like amount. More than a million dollars a year is now made available this way. The union for the past six years has also set aside 10 cents from each dues payment to support citizenship-education activities, adding another one and a half million.

Since 1946, the teaching has been done by men recruited from the ranks. There has been much greater emphasis on "tool subjects," and the dominant teaching technique has changed from lecture and questions to discussion. Role playing was introduced in steward training and collective bargaining. The UAW Education Department, now under the direction of Carroll Hutton, operates through 23 field representatives, supported by headquarters staff of 9. Field representatives work with local unions and regional officers to set up programs for local officers and members, in many cases in cooperation with universities. The field representatives also organize one-week long residential summer schools in each of the union's regions, attended by 5,000 local officers and stewards last year. They organize residential seminars in the winter. The headquarters staff prepares discussion materials, visual aids, films, recordings, pamphlets, and other materials for use by the local and regional schools.

Outside the "tool subject" area, the union has done such things as sponsor two conferences on the U.N., attended by hundreds of UAW delegates from all over the U.S.; its publications cover subjects of national and international significance; it actively promotes the sale of paperbacks of special interest to union members, purchases and places in school libraries a Labor Book Shelf, and stimulates interest among members in overseas travel.

The union also has a Leadership Studies Center for full-time staff. About 300 persons have attended sessions. A series of 15 three-week seminars has been held so far, with courses covering such subjects as current legal problems, current economic problems, civil rights and the law, and internal problems of the UAW. All groups also travel to a university for two-day, single subject sessions around such titles as "the union in the urban community" or "science and society." The program is work-related, but not confined to job training.

Staff and officer training represents a significant new current in labor education, and will probably develop in cooperation with university labor education centers. Labor educators will seek academicians as planners and teachers, but will insist on development of programs with a practical payoff, starting with practical problems and showing what relevance academic concepts may have for trade union people. Since its audience is highly influential in trade unions and in the society, the continued expansion of training for union staffs has great significance for the nation as a whole.

* * *

On Saturday evening, Professor Christian Bay, of the Political Science Department, Stanford University, addressed participants on "Educating for American Liberties: The Psychological Issues."

EDUCATING FOR AMERICAN LIBERTIES: THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ISSUES

Christian Bay

I couldn't think of a good story, so I thought I might begin with reading a paragraph from a paper which I think is a very good one. The title is intriguing: "Progress from Poverty: Make Love not War." The author is the Chairman of the Department of Sociology at Brandeis University, Professor John R. Seeley. He says something important about what happens to most children growing up through our school systems. I'll read these few sentences:

> What in rough outline our educational systems now do is to take the child--warm, living, flesh and spirit--in the kindergarten and nursery school, and turn him into sinew, scar tissue, skeleton at the high school, college or grad school exit. He comes full of life and leaves full of schemes; he comes open and leaves closed; he comes clad in self-awareness and goes in clanking armor; he comes singing, skipping, and dancing and leaves carrying himself, presenting himself, using himself, posing, and posturing. He comes to give and receives. He leaves the train at the door of life, not out of some inherent necessity of growing up--this is growing down--but because of our very structure and content of education designed to that end and rightly so. For what we have "needed" hitherto was not human beings but skilled ants and institutions appropriate to their production. Our schools and colleges are mostly anthills.[1]

I want to start out making clear what my value premises are, because I think some of them may differ substantially from some of yours. Therefore a good part of my allotted time will be given to explaining in some detail why I hold the values I do hold. I think the simplest point that can be made right away is that I am not particularly enthusiastic about our social system. I am enthusiastic about civil liberties. I think, however, you can never as a teacher stimulate a real interest and concern about civil liberties effectively unless you start out with a real dissatisfaction with the way things are working now. I sensed, not only in spokesmen for the corporations but also in representatives of the unions and schools, an opposite premise--that this is so good a socio-economic system that we ought to tell everyone how good it is, including our young workers, to get them to share our excitement. How fortunate we are in this country to have the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, we have been told. Now, I'm all in favor of the Bill of Rights, but not so terribly, certainly not without strong reservations, in favor of the United States Constitution; and I think our social order is pretty bad. It may be among the better ones existing, but I still feel it is pretty bad. I believe things are in the saddle, not men; things like corporations and laws suitable to their needs, not the needs of men. If our schools are bad, and I think they are, it is because our society up to now has required this kind of school.

---

[1] To be published in Liberation Magazine.

I have a friend who makes his living teaching philosophy. Whenever he gives a course in semantics, he likes to start out telling his students that he sees it as his most important task to undermine their confidence in the English language. First of all he wants his students to learn to communicate well--to reflect carefully on the possible meanings of each important word they use, and how it is most likely to be understood. I start out some of my political science and political theory classes in much the same way. I start by saying that my task is to undermine your confidence in the American institutions. I don't think they can be made to work much better than they are now unless we start out with a sense of profound dissatisfaction with them.

Ideally, then, I would have liked this Center to take on the task of fomenting dissatisfaction with our democratic institutions. You have chosen a more limited and, may I say, a more realistic task, within our system, namely to teach and encourage respect for civil liberties, and I believe in the value of your approach. Documents circulated in advance of this Conference certainly underscored, in my opinion, the urgent need for the work you are undertaking; there seems to be a widespread confusion in our society between citizenship education and inducing people to go out and vote for the best interests of their employers or unions.

By citizenship education I understand, as I believe you do, too, not just the teaching of tolerance but the stimulation of positive appreciation of the fact that people and groups have different characteristics; encouraging not just a willingness but an active interest in associating with people who are different; promoting not only broadmindedness but intellectual curiosity about dissenting political views.

To favor civil liberties in general is easy enough and many will quote with approval Voltaire's maxim about defending the right of others to say things he profoundly disagrees with. But to specifically include reference to the liberties of outcast groups like, say, communists, or homosexuals, usually raises eyebrows and sometimes intellectual objections as well. Perhaps I will stand a chance to be forgiven for transgressions of this kind if I succeed in making clear my own value commitments.

Basically I admit to only one value premise, but this one commitment I hold with religious fervor. It is to the sanctity of life for the individual human being. I include the sanctity of the child's right to be allowed to develop according to his inner needs. And I believe in the same right for the child to be born in the future. I should explain that when I speak of the value of the individual, I think of all individuals. I am not concerned, as many conservatives are, primarily with the strong and resourceful, the successful and creative. My allegiance is not to the doctrine of the greatest happiness for the greatest number. I am concerned, above all, with the people who are least free--the marginal people, the underdogs; and I value the freedom of a given society according to how well off the least free individuals are in that society.

Translated into legal terms, I believe that human rights are the only proper basic concern of governments. To me, government exists in order to create the kind of order in which human beings can live in a sphere of freedom. The instrumentality to see that all basic freedoms are granted to all, as a higher priority than granting additional, less basic freedoms to some, is the kind of thing we have in the American Bill of Rights, which is the one part of the American Constitution that I am enthusiastic about.

Nothing else than human life and its development in freedom should be sacred. Yet many speak as if a particular social system, like the free enterprise system, were sacred--as if one should be expected to agree that this system is to be preserved regardless of how well or how poorly it serves human beings. Capitalism should be open to discussion, in my opinion. Communism should be open to discussion. Democracy should be open to discussion. They are all to be weighed as possible means, as I see it, to freedom. Alexander Meiklejohn, the great civil libertarian, used to say that you are not really free to oppose communism if you are not also equally free to support communism without being punished for it. John Stuart Mill, in his famous essay On Liberty, stressed that we cannot really have any conviction that is alive to us unless it is freely challenged. We have to meet challenges like communism on intellectual grounds, rather than by way of police or economic sanctions.

Now I agree with Mr. Barry Goldwater that extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. In fact, this is as essential a part of my belief system as it is of his. The difference is that we are thinking of different people when we are talking of freedom. He is thinking primarily of the freedom of the strong. I am thinking of the freedom of the weak. Also, as a social scientist I am concerned with the necessity of research in order to establish what types of policy will tend to expand freedom, particularly the freedom of the weak.

I shall present my own definitions of "freedom" shortly. First, although I am supposed to speak on psychological issues, I must attempt a brief but broad sociological sweep, in order to place my discussion in the context of my own theory of how our societies work. There are basically two different ways of thinking, and always have been. There is *institutional* or traditional thinking on the one hand--the kind of thinking on the one hand--the kind of thinking assuming something is true because your father tells you, or the authorities tell you. And there is *rational* thinking, on the other hand. It may not amount to valid reasoning, necessarily, but at least it is the kind of thinking that comes when you face a problem and ask not only for the moral way of solving it, but for the effective way of solving it. Now, as you know, some societies have remained preliterate--what we sometimes call primitive--for centuries and centuries, and I think these are societies that have not faced the external challenge of enemies or climate. Eskimos have a hard climate all right, but have adopted stable ways of making a living and have not had many human enemies. But when societies get in trouble, like conflicts and wars, there is always a prize on new ideas, and this is when traditions start breaking down, and when the explicit awareness of tribal solidarity and identity develops; when *questions* develop. And as our civilization develops to its present level of infinite complexity we have need for a tremendous amount of rationality. We have vast storehouses of rationality that we call science, in which we have accumulated actual experience and generalizations down through the centuries; and we have vast factories which we call educational institutions to make sure we always will have an ample supply of new recruits who can supply intelligent, rational reasoning at all times.

Now there is one generalization we have to make about every social order that is at all stable. It divides itself among the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, the articulate and the inarticulate, the powerful and the powerless. By and large I think it is a sociological law that most of those who have happened to become wealthy, or powerful, or articulate, are going to like the present system fine. They have ways of making the rest seem to like it also. We get, in this way, a kind of de facto rule--not only over economic resources, but over psychological resources as well--on the part of the strong and the powerful. And this comes out in the way our educational institutions are run, and have been run in the past. Rationality of the highest degree is encouraged in all the natural sciences, like physics, chemistry, and biology, and also on the periphery of the social sciences, in technological matters, policy science methods, and so on. But when it comes to tackling the more basic social issues, the basic premises on which our society rests, to take them up for scholarly inquiry (e.g., does democracy promote social justice? Does capitalism waste human resources? etc.), then, as you know, there are strong incentives, to say the least, not to enter on a social science career in that field. An occasional C. Wright Mills can get away with it, but most political scientists find it wiser either to escape into grand theory, or become wizards in methodology and study relatively trivial issues.[1]

---

[1] See C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination* (New York: Grove Press), 1961, 1959.

There is one belief that generally is shared in every traditional hierarchy of power, and that is the assumption that human nature is pretty bad. All conservative writers down through history have wanted to blame human nature for what is wrong with society because this is a convenient rationalization for the seamy side of any social reality: it's all the fault of human nature. We should be grateful that things aren't worse. They couldn't possibly be much better, man being of such poor material. This assumption is shared by quite a few liberals, too. In particular, I am thinking of Christians like Reinhold Niebuhr, who has a very impressive and boldly liberal mind.[1] But the inherited Christian dogma of sin has made him and other Christian liberals natural allies of conservatism, to a considerable extent.

My own basic premises about man and society are directly opposite to the conservative view: Never underestimate human nature. Never underestimate the potentialities of a child, or any other human being. On the other hand, never overestimate the benevolence of political or social institutions.

As a social researcher I plead for much more study of the extent to which human greed, crime, and destructive selfishness in the narrow sense may be attributable to social institutions, in highly competitive societies where the stakes are high and where corruptive incentives are strong. It just could be that it isn't human nature, as such, that makes it hard for men in some societies to live with one another. It could be that the chief trouble is with the social institutions under which they live.

Now of course we cannot study human nature directly. We can only study specific human beings as they are clad in a particular cultural garment. They are shaped by individual human experience in their families, schools, communities, and so on. To accumulate knowledge about man as a species is at best a slow and exceedingly complex enterprise. But since so little is as yet firmly known, I believe we ought to be open to the possibility that human life can be improved if social institutions are improved. Admittedly, an opposite hypothesis cannot be entirely ruled out: it is possible that we have achieved the best possible world within the capacity of human nature. But to accept this view as a dogma is to inoculate ourselves against progress, and indeed against ever learning whether man may be capable of a better social life on this earth in the future.

I conclude that as a practical matter, at least, we ought to assume that human behavior, good or bad, to a considerable extent may be determined by, or influenced by, social institutions, and that all social institutions should be studied with an open mind. We should study if there is something we can learn from communism, for example, as freely as we seek to establish what is valuable or less valuable about our own system; I don't see how we could lose if we approach both inquiries in a rational manner.

---

[1] For example, see his The Children of Light and The Children of Darkness (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons), 1960 (1944).

Not everything about communism is bad; not everything about American democracy is good, just because we call it "American." I regret to say that most of the current college courses on the theme of freedom versus communism appear to have been designed to close the students' minds, not to open them.[1]

In my profession of political science there is a kind of schizophrenia these days. Behavioral research with all its modern techniques has been very valuable in demonstrating the extent to which the actual processes of decision making have very little to do with the classical ideals of democracy. We know in some detail how different pressure groups work, how opinions are communicated, what kinds of people and social roles tend to have the power--in fact, I recommend a recent book by Murray Edelman called The Symbolic Uses of Politics which ably sums up much of this work.[2] He concludes that wherever there is a conflict, as there so often is between the many relatively unorganized and the few highly organized groups with inside connections, you get this sort of compromise: the rhetoric, the symbols are given to the many; the tangible benefits are given to the few. For example, if radio and television get too commercialized, there may emerge so much dissatisfaction involving so many voters, that eventually we get a Federal Communications Commission, which looks very good on paper. Then it is staffed with people who are very protective of the broadcasting industry, so that not much really happens to the industry, and everybody feels satisfied for a while.

Behavioral political scientists are wise to the workings and the significance of these processes, and yet many of them firmly hold on to the ideology of democracy; some keep believing in democracy almost as a kind of panacea, as if they hadn't just disproved the relevance of most of the classical reasons why we should want democracy. This is their kind of conformity to a system which works pretty well for them. The affluent professors have it pretty good. There is perhaps no compelling reason why they shouldn't want to participate in the blessings of democracy, whether they think of it as rule by the people or as rule by corporations or by other minorities.

As every stable social order has its myths that cement it, and serve to maintain its rulers in power, so of course the myth that the people rule in our democracy serves the interests of those in our society who have the actual power. It is very hard for most Americans not to believe in the reality of the democratic ways as they have been taught in the schools. It feels good to be indoctrinated with the idea and to keep on believing that you actually have the power, that you are actually running the show. That tends to make you a complacent citizen who is willing to accept even outrageous policies at times, because you are led to believe that this is the will of the majority. De Tocqueville noted in his

---

[1] For a partisan but well documented study, see Annette Zelman, Teaching "About Communism" in American Public Schools (New York: Humanities Press), 1965.

[2] (Urbana: University of Illinois Press), 1964.

Democracy in America, written in the Jacksonian age, that if you are a man of conscience, with convictions of your own, you may in some respects be worse off in a democracy. If you live under a tyrant you can be oppressed all right, but your mind isn't. If, on the other hand, you are led to believe that it is a majority of the people who are shaping your life in your democracy, it is awfully hard to maintain your independence of spirit, your courage to dissent. You change your mind or you fear you may suffer not only ostracism but a sense of guilt.[1]

Contemporary political scientists have done something practical, given this kind of incipient schizophrenia about democracy. They have redefined the concept of politics. I noticed one of the citizenship education posters displayed in the next room: "Get into politics to defend your interests." Well, in classical times "politics" referred to the art and science of promoting the public good. We have come a long way from that concept in our teaching of politics at most of our universities. In Harold D. Lasswell's famous and influential phrase, "politics" refers to "who gets what, when, how." Now, Jean-Jacques Rousseau wrote two hundred years ago something with which, as a behavioral scientist, I have to agree: "Were there a people of gods, their government would be democratic. So perfect a government is not for men."[2] Who will look out for the public interest if everyone is looking out for his private interests? Who will worry about the future? Who will worry about the powerless, the downtrodden? This is enough to indicate to you why, like Rousseau, I cannot give three cheers for democracy. E. M. Forster once wrote a collection of essays called Two Cheers for Democracy.[3] Personally I am willing to give one and a half cheer, maybe, but that is about all.

I give three cheers for freedom, however, and now it is about time I define what I mean by "freedom." I mean self-expression--expression of what is in you now and what is potentially in you. That requires three things: a capacity, your psychological capacity to know yourself, to express yourself, to think and act in accord with your inner needs; it requires opportunity so that you're not pushed around, clapped in jail, or starved to death; and thirdly, it requires incentives to develop. Here is where the cultural resources come in, because you can feel perfectly free, yet live in a totalitarian society and just not know that there are other ways of living that might suit you better, or you can be brainwashed to believe you have all the power, when actually you have very little power, even over yourself.

I use the term "psychological freedom" for the first aspect of freedom. You are psychologically free to the extent that you are not neurotic, not all tied up in knots, not repressed so that your own basic motives are hidden to you; to the extent that you overcome these obstacles, you are psychologically free. Spontaneity is closely related empirically to psychological freedom.

---

[1] See Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, especially Vol. I, pp. 269-80 (New York: Vintage Books), 1954 (1835-40), Vols. I-II.

[2] Social Contract, Book, III, Chapter IV.

[3] (London: Arnold), 1954.

The opportunity to be free, social freedom, is the opposite of being coerced. And the extreme of coercion is if you are killed or suffer physical violence.

The third aspect of freedom as I understand this concept is a little more complicated, and I won't go into it at length, but I will say that you are free in this sense if you are not made the tool of other people's interests. You are free in this sense (David Riesman et al use the term "autonomy"),[1] if you are able to choose whether to conform or not to conform. To the extent that you are aware of different alternatives you are free in this third "potential" sense.

In the United States today the extent of psychological freedom is pretty good. I think more than in most countries we have had intelligent psychologists, physicians, and so on, teaching mothers how to bring up their children and make them secure in their early childhood. Freud taught--and I believe this--that the first few years of a child's life are very important in determining whether he can develop a positive, trusting relationship to himself. Dr. Spock has done much to equip a large part of our population with a great deal of psychological capacity for being free, and for valuing freedom for oneself and others.

With respect to social freedom, and remember that in my judgments I stress the freedom of the least free, it is more of a mixed bag. One fifth of Americans, at least, are not very free.[2] Perhaps they are freer than the poor in some other countries; but, given the resources we have in this country, it is a notable failure that we still have skid rows, urban and rural slums, and lack of dire necessities of life and health for many people, including the very young and the very old.

On the third level, which I call potential freedom, or the ability to choose between the norms to pay allegiance to, we are in a very bad state. I think it is enough to refer to what has been said earlier by several speakers, about how afraid we are of ideas radically different from our own--communism, atheism, and all the rest. The very concept of "Un-American activities" testifies to this attitude, and the fact that the United States Congress still maintains a House Committee on Un-American Activities, whose own activities appear to be condoned or even welcomed by most Americans, indicates the extent to which potential freedom has been lost in this country. How many non-communists have stood up for the right of communists to advocate their ideas freely?

---

[1] The Lonely Crowd, pp. 278-79 (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books), 1953 (1950).

[2] See, for example, Michael Harrington, The Other America (Baltimore: Penguin Books), 1963 (1962).

A term like "freedom" is a very powerful thing. We can make almost everybody believe in any cause if it once becomes effectively associated with "freedom." Those who have power in the United States have, of course, defined freedom in a way that suits them. "Freedom" conventionally refers to primarily free enterprise and free speech. Now free speech suits a professor fine, and I am all in favor of it; but I am even more deeply concerned with the freedom of the whole human being. I am concerned first with the freedom to eat, to find shelter, to feed your children. These, however, are freedoms that most people with influence in this country take for granted. But the trouble is that most of the world's population doesn't take those freedoms for granted at all. I think that the strength of the political appeal of communism in so many countries in many parts of the world is that the communists always demand first of all these much more basic and pressing freedoms--that is, the freedoms needed most badly by the less free, the less fortunate; they champion poor people's freedom to have the basic necessities of life secured for them even at the expense of, for example, a free press.

As I said, I like a free press, but not at the expense of people starving. We keep trying to export our kind of democracy to Latin America, for example. In practice this means competing newspapers downtown, and nobody in power caring about children dying in the slums. Under these circumstances I can understand why many idealistic Latin Americans become enthusiastic for Castro.[1] In the United States we give Castro a very bad press. For example, he introduces rationing of food, which to most affluent Americans seems a bad idea. But to people in Rio's slums rationing would mean that some food is assured to each of them every day, which would be close to Heaven. They couldn't care less about the newspapers downtown which they can't afford to buy anyway.[2]

Too often, in the underdeveloped world, we are politically ineffective because the freedom message of "the free world" tends to be 1/3 Stuart Mill and 2/3 Herbert Hoover, with perhaps a whiff of Dixiecrat mixed in. It is remarkable how in the U. S. Senate the Democrats who claim to care most deeply about the freedom of the South Vietnamese these days are those from south of the Mason-Dixon line.

I come, finally, to what is my real topic--that is the psychological problems of teaching an interest in civil liberties and support for civil liberties. I want to talk briefly about motivations for opinions, in the first place, and after that, again briefly, about motivations for learning.

---

[1] See John Gerassi, The Great Fear in Latin America (New York: Collier), 1965 (1963).

[2] For an enlightening and moving document substantiating this point, see Child of the Dark: The Diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus (New York: Signet Books), 1963 (1962) (First published in Portuguese in 1960).

There are basically at least three different reasons why we hold any opinion. In the first place, and this is a key assumption in the classics of democratic theory, we may hold an opinion because it makes sense to us; it explains things for us. Call this the rationality motive. Secondly, we can hold an opinion because it is the popular opinion to hold. We may call this the social acceptance motive; we hold views that serve our reputations so that we can be approved of as sound thinking citizens. Thirdly, we can hold opinions for neurotic reasons.[1]

Let me give as an example prejudice against the Negro. I think it is possible to grow up in this country with prejudice against the Negro on a perfectly rational basis. One sees Negroes in inferior positions and an explanation is offered: they are biologically inferior. If you know only that much, it makes sense. You can have a rationally-based prejudice. More often, you discover, subtly or blatantly, that to estimate or treat the Negro as a social equal just isn't done in your particular circles. Rather than living and speaking against your beliefs, you change your beliefs, perhaps subconsciously. You rationalize, and acquire prejudice on a conformity- or social acceptance basis. And, finally, you may, as research in the tradition of *The Authoritarian Personality* has shown, have prejudice because you are so dubious about your own worth as a human being that you need the kind of crutch you can get with looking down on other people.

The importance of knowing the motivations for the opinions we have (of course these are all mixed up in all of us; we are all conformists and neurotics to some extent) is that you know then something about how you can influence opinions. To the extent that we have opinions based on the rationality motive, and to that extent only, are we open to facts, evidence, rational argument. This helps explain some of the frustrations of many liberal organizations, whose pamphlets and other literature have been less effective than hoped for: good liberals often have tended to overestimate the role of reason as a basis for personal opinions.

To the extent that you have a social acceptance basis for prejudice, or any other opinion, arguments are useless. But if some highly prestigeful person (in your estimation, too) comes over to tell you that you are wrong, that is the way to reach you. Finally, if you belong to the neurotic, the fearful, the people who are scared, who project their own weaknesses to other people, than neither argument based on evidence nor prestigeful persuasion will cut any ice. The stronger the case the more threatened, fearful and hateful you may become. The most we can do, short of psychoanalysis, is to try to limit this type of person's influence. I am not in favor of putting people in jail because of pathological opinions they may have, but you can, in the interest of having everyone live together in peace, work to try to keep them out of influential positions in the Pentagon, for example, or the White House, or Congress.

---

[1] I am indebted to Irving Sarnoff and Daniel Katz, "The Motivational Bases of Attitude Change," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 49 (1954), pp. 115-24; Daniel Katz, "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 24 (1960), pp. 163-204; and M. Brewster Smith, Jerome S. Bruner and Robert W. White, *Opinion and Personality* (New York: John Wiley), 1964 (1956).

[2] By T. W. Adorno *et al* (New York: Harper), 1950.

And there is one other thing to keep in mind about motives of opinions. Of all the opinions we have--of course we all differ as individuals, too, with regard to the relative importance of different motives--whether we be among the more or among the less neurotic, the conventional pressures in matters of opinion are stronger in some areas of belief than in others. Saul Alinsky often argues that if you want to reach the underprivileged, don't talk about far-away issues like Vietnam, talk about how the butcher is cheating on the scale; this they immediately understand. On the near issues they can't so easily be brainwashed.

On the other hand, the more you get to the large issues--like the foreign policy issues--the less do most individuals have a real individual stake in one opinion or another; the greater the extent, accordingly, to which they are subject to brainwashing, and indeed to psychological escalation when the going gets rough, and nationalist sentiment is being whipped up. These are issues that basically don't mean much to the average individual. What does mean something is to be on the side of the American flag, with the authority figures. So this is one of our psychological problems in resisting senseless large-scale violence in a fear- and conformity-governed polity. Our foreign policy and military machine increasingly seems to work like a car without brakes,--with only an accelerator, or an escalator; an inbred mechanism seems to make sure that the worse things get, the stronger the emotional appeals to rally round the flag and flock around the leader--much as the lemmings do in my country of origin, Norway. You never are in a position to really know whether the leader will take you over the abyss or to some more pleasant destination. The conformist and the jingoist may feel comfortable about their own patriotism, yet they contribute no effort to thinking about their country's future; I call this lemming patriotism.

Let me now turn to the problems of motivating people to learn. First there is the problem of the alienation of powerlessness. John R. Seeley[1] defines poverty as the lack of power to command events. And this sense of lack of power, which I think is realistic, only gets more frustrating when you are constantly being congratulated for living in a democracy. For somehow you feel in your bones that however often you go around and vote and are a good citizen, if you are at the lower end of the scale, you are going to remain there. There was a time when the United States was the beacon of liberty for all the liberals and radicals in Europe. It was said that with these many states the new nation had the advantage of as many different social laboratories. You could experiment with progress in a way that no other nation could. Yet, even on a state level we have a pretty uniform system. We have not very much political experimentation. Economic analysts have shown, for example (there is a book by Gabriel Kolko called Wealth and Power in America,[1] with a great deal of detail), that in the statistical sense the relationships of the national income earned by the rich and the poor was almost exactly the same in 1960 as in 1910. However much we work our democratic political game, the economic realities seem to change very little.

---

[1] See the paper referred to in note 1, page 76.

There seems to me to be at least one source of hope, however, in a generally gloomy picture of our democracy as an instrument of social change, or of social justice. I think in recent times we have found a few new social techniques for changing things. I am thinking chiefly of the civil rights movement and of modern techniques of civil disobedience. Paradoxically, perhaps the fact that so many individuals have had the good sense and the courage to respect the rule of law less than they respect the rule of justice has been a crucial factor in getting our system, to a certain extent, moving. The Supreme Court has to a considerable extent become an agent of social justice instead of corporate wealth under the impact and instruction of this kind of movement. The world situation has had some influence, too; after all, communist-controlled powers have been competing for the support of all the new, mainly non-Caucasian nations which the United States would like to keep within the so-called free world.[2] In any event, the fact that there has been civil disobedience and progress in civil rights, student rights, and civil liberties must have reduced the scope and extent of alienation, by seeming to show that our system is not completely immune to political change.

In some areas in the American South in which there have been big political upheavals, there are data to show that Negro crime went down during this period.[3]

---

[1] (New York: Praeger), 1964 (1962).

[2] Of some importance, surely, has been the NAACP's 1947 appeal to the United Nations for redress of the American Negro's grievances. See An Appeal to the World (New York: NAACP), 1947.

[3] Fredric Solomon, Walker L. Walker, Garrett O'Connor and Jacob Fishman, "Civil Rights Activity and Reduction of Crime Among Negroes," Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 12 (1965), pp. 227-236.

Seondly there is the belief that we have equal economic opportunity in this country. This belief can be pleasant enough when you're ahead, but is likely to be a great burden, psychologically, if you are behind. Somehow you are being asked to assume that you have only yourself to blame for your poverty or lack of education. In effect it may seem that you are asked to believe that you are not as valuable as other human beings.

And here comes the modern concept, thirdly, of cultural deprivation. This phrase easily encourages an institutionalized negative evaluation of your family and yourself, which can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is awfully hard to live with a self-image asserting that you are culturally deprived, that you really can't compete. It is a wrong image, I think. One of my colleagues at Stanford recently studied youngsters from what she calls "culturally disadvantaged" homes. She worked on the theory that these kids had been brought up from childhood to reject verbal communication; most words from adults might seem to them to amount to nothing but telling them what to do, with the things "to do" usually being without any real meaning for them. She had a small amount of money available for the children if they would stay in school and do good work. They had been virtually given up by the schools; they were presumed unable to do adequately in school and were destined to become dropouts. Yet every one of them in the group included in this small pilot study did standard work and in some cases superior work.[1] This brings me back to my premise--never underestimate a child. In fact, don't underestimate the potentialities of adults either--not even of the many alcoholics on skid row who are called incurable. We are too quick to use that stamp. It is a convenient excuse whenever we haven't tried very hard, or very intelligently, to remedy a social ill or cure an illness.

A fourth issue in motivating for learning is tied up with a failure to distinguish job training from education. Education is for life, for citizenship; training is for a place in the economic system. Job training, and job retraining too, easily runs up against a vicious circle, psychologically speaking; if you don't really believe that there is going to be a job, this interferes with your motivation to learn; then you get bad grades and this knocks your self-image down further. Unlike education at its best, job training has no value unless it can get you a job, and it can harm you a great deal if visible unemployment discourages you from applying yourself fully. In the end, when you have no job and it all seems a waste, you too easily see yourself as poor (re)training material and perhaps as basically uneducable as well.

The most general point that I would like to make about the problem of developing allegiance to civil liberties among working class members, and among the underprivileged generally in our middle class-dominated society, is quite simple: What we are up against is the fact that many of these people, including the young workers, tend to have such massive anxieties about their own identity as individuals, and about their social status and their future, that they just don't have the excess of energy to worry about the liberties or opportunities of other people.

---

[1] cf. Bernadine Allen. "Behavior Modification of Study Habits of Educationally Disadvantaged Students." Paper read at the California State Psychological Association's annual meeting in January, 1966, in San Francisco.

There is a recent book which I think is more illuminating than any other book I've read on this subject for some time--*The Uncommitted*, by Kenneth Keniston.[1] Keniston gives the American system its due. He says that America has performed a miracle by making most of our society affluent. No other civilization has ever managed to achieve that. In fact, maybe only a fifth now is in really bad shape from an economic point of view. Yet, he points out, even with the fullness of the larder there is still a tremendous dissatisfaction. There is some degree of alienation in practically all of us, and there are extreme degrees of alienation in many young people, not only among the underprivileged who can't compete but also among the kinds of people he particularly studied,--Harvard students who could compete but didn't want to because they considered the whole system vicious. Let me quote briefly from Dr. Keniston: "All to often, t

> All too often the "tolerance" of Americans is a thin veneer over the discomfort created by all that is different, strange, and alien to them....Those who are inwardly torn, unsure of their psychic coherence and fearful of inner fragmentation, are naturally distrustful of all that is alien and strange. Those whose sense of inner unity is tenuous are easily threatened by others who remind them of that part of themselves they seek to suppress. Our "one hundred percent Americans" are those whose own Americanism is felt to be most tenuous; the bigoted and the prejudiced cannot live with the full gamut of their own feelings.[2]

Our whole social system, writes Keniston, has stressed efficiency, productiveness, and so on; such attitudes and self-concepts may well have been necessary to build up American industry. But it has been built up at the price of what he calls the "dictatorship of the ego." The playfulness and the softer side of our human nature has traditionally been virtually suppressed by most of our red-blooded American males. For many white people this has nourished the prejudices against Negroes, because we have the feeling that somehow they have more fun than we have, that they are less responsible and hard-working than we are; to believe they are as good as we are could undermine our sense of righteousness, and our faith in salvation through hard work.

---

[1] (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World), 1965.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 442-43.

Now what is the way out? First, I think we need a welfare society, where there is a floor of security under each person and family's basic living standard, a welfare society of some kind, whether it be established by way of a negative income tax or by the triple revolution concept of a guaranteed annual income for all, or by some other strategy.[1] Secondly, it is not only necessary to have the assurance of knowing you can survive physically: also, in an increasingly automated society, with un- and underemployment, you have to find a meaning in life. For one thing, you have to become a political animal somehow, in a broad sense. Aristotle believed men to be political by nature; probably he was right, but our rulers want apolitical men. I do believe that it is in the healthy human being's nature to care about the larger society and about the future. The best approach, probably, toward making more young people more aware of the political aspects of social life is to teach them about immediate, local issues. This is where you can start, with local issues and projects. There are all kinds of possible community projects, theatres, and so on, which might put to constructive and pleasurable use almost unlimited amounts of space and time. Drama projects can instruct people in the finer things of life, in a way that no other art form can quite match, I believe. There should of course be opportunities to go to college, in some sense, for all. Colleges should become the kind of community centers in which all people belong from time to time and which they keep coming back to.

Let me conclude with a parable. If you think of garbage collection, this is today a perfectly respectable occupation. Nobody need be ashamed of being in that field and yet very few, I think, in that field see their work as the whole purpose of their lives--devoting the whole of their lives to the cause of collecting garbage more effectively, week by week. The prosaic attitude of the scavenger or sanitation worker ought, I think, to become the rule in all industrial work, which by and large should be neither debasing nor ennobling. It should make no difference whether you produce cars or washing machines, raise hogs or work for an airline. Work should be part of the individual's life, but never his whole life. Work should be a means to an end; the end surely must be to live, to be alive and to grow as a human being; to become more human by helping others achieve their dignity and humanity. Rather than adapting our lives to the needs of corporations, we should strive to change our socio-economic institutions until they come to serve much better than they do now the needs of human beings. And stockholders are not the only important human beings.

"Things are in the saddle, and they ride mankind," Emerson wrote. The mightiest things in our society are the corporations, and then the government apparatus, the unions and the other large organizations. Individuals have increasingly become pawns in the battles among impersonal giants. Yet in our universities we have produced increasing knowledge of our immutable needs as individual human beings,--not only our physical and biological needs but out needs for security, dignity, self-esteem, affection, freedom, a sense of growth,--needs which can be suppressed but only at the price of neurosis, alienation, or crime.

---

[1] See Robert Theobald, Free Men and Free Markets (New York: Anchor), 1965 (1963); and, by the same author, The Guaranteed Income: Next Step in Economic Evolution? (New York: Doubleday), 1966.

When will we learn to place things in the service of our needs as human beings?

The most vital task underlying the problem of educating about civil liberties, as I see it, is to promote the view that man himself, his chances to live and be free, is the end, and that all social and economic systems--including democracy, communism and capitalism--should be studied and argued about strictly as means; they are *things*, just like corporations, and should never be above or below dispassionate study and discussion. The only commitment I advocate is to the sanctity of human life itself, and to the cause of freedom for all human beings to develop according to the needs and potentialities rooted in their nature. Degrees of actual violence and oppression in our time are to me the basic indicators of priorities in the work for rights and liberties.

* * *

Conference discussion generally centered around three questions: What's wrong with what's being done now to teach American liberties, especially to young workers or to groups alienated from the society? What's being done that seems effective? How can the Center help to improve the educational situation?

The orientation of the discussion can best be seen in the comments of two participants, Dean Clarence Walton and Professor Richard F. W. Whittemore:

> *Dean Clarence Walton:* Our concern has literally been, what makes one a member of the *polis*? Once those who were propertyless in American society were told, "You are non-people." Those who were Irish-Catholic or Jewish in Rhode Island

> were told, "You are non-people." Negroes, for far too long, have been told, "You, too, are non-people." The workers up until recent times were told the same thing. Therefore, we are really concerned with--how do you make people people?

> Professor Richard Whittemore: Why is it that we aren't doing the job and why is it that we are less able to cope with the problem. We have agreed that in the society today there is rapid change, complexity. There is, in society, a host of problems with which the individual finds he cannot cope, and therefore he feels displaced. Fundamental to this sense of displacement is ignorance--a progressive, relative ignorance.
>
> Obviously we need the help of corporations, labor, the Office of Education, everybody, to try and remedy this situation. It is time we addressed ourselves to the fundamental question of how do you deal with this ignorance--how do you get at this essential problem of making people able to cope? I don't have the answer, but I hope the conference will start us on the way and that the Center will grapple with the problem as nobody else has yet done.

Authoritarianism in the Schools

Participants raised the basic question of whether commitment to American liberties and democratic citizenship can be taught in a non- or un-democratic environment. It was suggested that schools are authoritarian by nature, and therefore not appropriate settings for civil liberties education. Several participants disagreed that schools need be so authoritarian that civil liberties education is impossible, but there was a consensus that authoritarianism in schools as they operate now should be drastically reduced:

> Dr. Martin Deutsch: Right now there is a certain intellectual authoritarianism that runs throughout society and is particularly reflected in the school system. It tends to mitigate rational argument, and leads to a kind of polarization, total social acceptance orientation on the one hand, or total dissent without any kind of attenuating philosophy on the other.

I think a Center such as this could do an analysis of intellectual authoritarianism. I have done some experiments in this--where we would have a meeting of teachers, and agree with a particular position taken by the teachers, knowing that the principal takes a different position. When the principal comes in, we always see two-thirds of the teachers swing over and make a social accommodation in the direction not of their ideology, but of the authority system.

How can we ask teachers to be inventive with a democratic curriculum when they themselves are constantly making accommodations that are in essence non-democratic? There is a lot this Center could do toward defining a concept of individual independence that sets limits on the invasion of privacy and pressures to accommodate.

Mr. Ray Smith: I think we certainly can teach civil liberties in the classroom as it is presently structured but only if we are careful to match our actions to our words in regard to civil liberties, from Superintendents and administrators to teachers and teacher aides.

Also, there are other areas in the school system that need to be examined. I am thinking of the superintendent in charge of purchasing who in a subtle way reduces the content of dissent allowed teachers. Teachers aren't allowed to decorate their rooms in the way they want, aren't allowed to select the furniture they want--consequently you wind up with a school that is the same throughout.

It is these subtle things that need to be changed, to encourage an administrator to encourage individualization and not take the easy way out.

Professor Martin Rein: Teachers need some kind of commitment to civil liberties in order to "teach" it. Students won't develop any commitment to civil liberties if they don't have some teachers who believe in civil liberties and act on their belief in the classroom.

Getting Qualified Teachers

Related to this discussion was the question of getting qualified teachers. Participants criticized rigid state certification requirements as one bar to getting good teachers, especially as schools try to develop ways to meet the needs of disadvantaged children, and expressed concern at getting good teachers to go where they are needed:

Dr. Alva R. Dittrick: We find it one of our greatest difficulties to find the teachers for economics and citizenship education--knowledgeable and skillful enough to handle these subjects. We find that some of the roadblocks are the standards in certification requirements which are legislated by the state.

For example, in trying to develop teaching of the disadvantaged, we need much more counseling than we have, and yet when we put down "counselor," we are stuck with certification requirements. Is it possible to take a look and make an evaluation of some of these standards which have developed over the last 40 or 50 years, together with the requirements for teacher certification, to see if some change of direction should be made there?

Professor Richard F. W. Whittemore: At Teachers College we are faced with an impossible situation. We have a program that is entirely graduate, and yet we have requirements which force people into what are essentially undergraduate courses to fill in all the nooks and crannies that are required.

I hope that with your suggestion and a number of people at the college who are interested in this, that we can do this kind of study. We have to demonstrate to the state that the certification requirements are indeed impediments rather than aids.

Mr. Martin Deutsch: Something has gone wrong with our system of socialization, so that we have lost a good deal of the necessary informal control. As a result, we have certain formal social restrictions that attempt to limit full participation in the society to those who are "safe."

I think this is related to the problem of certification. For example, we have in certain areas Negro men who are serving as assistant teachers, and have been for several years. They are not certified, but they are excellent as teachers. As far as ability is concerned, they should be certified, but the system denies it and requires that they go through a certain charade to attain certification and enter the school system on their own for a decent income.

Dean Rupert Evans: How can we get good teachers where we most need them? In college, the best schools pick the best students, and students who need education the most go to the worst schools. The best public school teachers can avoid going to the most deprived areas.

Professor Christian Bay: Couldn't we have federal aid to provide economic incentives to bring good teachers to places in which teachers don't want to teach?

Experimental Approaches Now Used

Participants discussed what could be learned from experimental approaches which have been used to try to make citizenship education meaningful to students, especially to those, whether children or adults, workers or the unemployed, poor whites or poor Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans, who are alienated from and antagonistic to the middle class orientation of public school citizenship education, and to "going to school" itself. A central problem is for the teacher to learn to communicate with these students--to gain their confidence and establish a relationship of mutual trust:

> Dr. Samuel D. Proctor: You have to realize that most of these people you want to reach--like people who would be affected by the Poverty Program, most of the Negroes in the slums, these people don't believe that you're really trying to help them.
>
> They've been disappointed too many times--they think the Poverty Program is just one more attempt to bamboozle them, to fool them--just a cosmetic or an anesthetic to cover up how bad their lives really are, to lull them into accepting things as they are. The first thing you have to do is get some trust.
>
> Mr. Arthur Reese: The kind of teaching we do in the Freedom Schools can take place in a regular classroom, but it can also occur on steps, in a church, in a corner drugstore, anywhere. The place doesn't matter because lessons always start with the individual, with the experience of the student himself.
>
> The dialogue can begin at once because they recognize, or we teachers show them, that we, the teachers are the culturally deprived. You can't assume that because a teacher has gone through teacher training, he can teach children from a different background than his own. The teacher is culturally deprived about the things the children know from their own lives.
>
> We have to learn the language of our students--we have to learn to relate to them, to establish a relationship with them. Everything we teach--history, geography--is involved with relationships. For instance, it isn't so important to me that Columbus discovered America in 1492, but it is important why people wanted to go exploring--

what were the relationships of people at the time? So we discuss historical relationships, economic relationships, and their interactions--and here the students are very sophisticated.

The poor know more about their problems than anyone else. They know what they want--we help them see how the democratic system works. What are the facilities provided within the democratic framework? How can you remove some of the blocks? How can you make yourself heard so that you can get someone else to remove these blocks?

Professor Richard F. W. Whittemore: We had a citizenship education project at Columbia in the early 50's, based on the idea that students have to take part not only in the synthetic world of the classroom, but in the real world of the community--no mock assemblies, but real situations involving them as citizens with a role in the decision-making process.

The program folded when the projected ended--somehow it was too difficult for teachers to handle. It raised difficulties with communities. It was too expensive. I still think we must do something like this. The vocational dimension of education gives us a natural bridge from the classroom to the outside world. If we can devise ways to get outside the classroom which don't simply die when the driving force behind their introduction stops, we will have gone a long way.

Mr. Harry Van Arsdale, Jr.: In Puerto Rico the government had a Community Education Program. They wanted to bring about an increase in literacy, understanding of the government, social services, and so on. So they got a building and set up classes, but nobody would come. The people there don't trust something so "official," they don't like this "big building" business. So the teachers took their loud speaker out under a tree. A few people came over, and stayed, and a few more, and pretty soon they had a real education program going.

Mr. Carl Schlesinger: In Detroit, the UAW is trying to do something like this by setting up several storefront "centers"--they don't call them "schools"--scattered throughout the neighborhoods where workers live. What they're trying to do is take education *to* the people.

Dialogue Methods

Two participants who have used a dialogue method in teaching citizenship and civil liberties expressed their belief that the students already have the democratic values--"teaching" is a method of helping students to articulate those values and see what they mean in real situations:

> Mr. Harry Fleischman: As I described in my paper, you don't "teach" belief in civil liberties--you evoke it out of people. Americans usually already believe in fairness, or in free speech. What you have to do is to show them the contradictions between their beliefs in principles, and their reactions against letting, say, a socialist speak.
>
> Mr. Arthur Reese: The people have from their own lives all the democratic values we talk about--you don't have to "teach" them. It's a question of evoking the values they already have and helping them see the relationships between things in their lives and things in the society and the world outside.
>
> When someone suggested to some of these students that they take over Senator Eastland's farm, divide up the land and so on. Well, it just didn't take hold. They started to talk about it, and as they discussed it, they talked about what it's like to lose your hand. Their families have a long history of losing their farms through some shenanigans and what not on the part of other people. They didn't want anybody to be able to take somebody else's land. They see the values of owning your own land.
>
> But you see, we didn't "teach" them that--we just ask questions or supply information and they teach themselves. They learn to relate what they already know and value to things outside their lives. But they wouldn't learn it if the teacher hadn't learned to speak their language, to develop a relationship and a dialogue with them.

Lack of Teaching About Dissent

Turning from methods to content, participants criticized the schools for avoiding teaching "seriously" about the history of dissent in America, thereby not giving students a clear understanding of the legitimacy of dissent. It was argued that labor unions, like other dissenting groups, receive poor treatment at the hands of public education:

> Mr. William Abbott: The average young union member who comes into the factory has not the vaguest idea of what a union is, what his rights are. He doesn't know the history of the American worker, although he may know the history of the American business class, and he certainly knows about our great soldiers and military leaders. But not about the common man, his own heritage. He leaves school knowing absolutely nothing and I think this is quite a condemnation of the American school system.
>
> One day at the University of Illinois library, I went and looked up all the textbooks that were used in primary and secondary school education, and there was only one I could honestly say presented a balanced picture of the American working man. I analyzed them both from the point of view of the history of the worker, and also the history of the underdog, the protest movements like the civil rights movement, beginning with the abolitionists.
>
> There was either no mention of protests and so on, or they were presented only from the critical side, like the abolitionists being viewed from the Southern side. Dissent is not taught in our public schools with any degree of seriousness, I don't feel. So workers come into the plant with intolerant attitudes, and we have to use the mechanism of labor education to try to bring out creative rebellion. I use this term because I can't think of any other name--if we are going through such a great change, we have to encourage individual creative thought.

> Mr. Carl Schlesinger: Young people often come to us after having been cruelly exploited by their employers because it was their first job and they had no notion of their rights, or of what labor unions are for, or that they have a right to join unions.
>
> In this country's history, fights for civil liberties have often sprung from the working people. We've had problems of civil liberties since 1776 when the printers first struck in Philadelphia, and it was ruled an illegal strike and broken. But young people in our schools don't learn these things. They don't know what unions are for.

Impossibility of Avoiding Controversy

Attempts in schools, or anywhere else, to teach citizenship in a "neutral" way, in order to avoid arousing the antagonism of communities or members or employees, were criticized as unrealistic. If they succeed in being "neutral," they have succeeded in removing the real content of democratic citizenship education. The only solution is for those groups which support the teaching of controversy to take an active part in school planning--as by running for the Board of Education and learning to cope with the antagonism of those who oppose such teaching:

> Professor Aaron W. Warner: What are the purposes of various education programs? I would suggest that civil liberties and public affairs education are not the same thing, are quite different, and that the function of civil liberties education--the opening of channels of dissent--is not performed by what is often called public affairs education.
>
> Mr. Rubin Maloff: I want to question this whole idea of being "neutral" in these corporation public affairs programs. We're going through a period of great change in this society--in civil rights, in economics, in everything--and you can't be "neutral" in your attitude toward change.
>
> Either you're for change, and for people acting to change their own lives and places in this society, or you're against change and want things to stay as they are. You don't deal with the problem when you have a "non-partisan" program where one Republican and one Democrat urge people to "get active in politics."
>
> Professor Alan F. Westin: If you want to have a discussion of public affairs roles, the question is shouldn't the corporation raise the issues in these programs of whether citizenship isn't broader than party affiliation or party participation? Doesn't it go to group identification? Don't they have to talk at some point about what values are involved in a given program? Don't they have to tell people what supposedly lies behind the political issues they're dealing with?
>
> The same thing goes for the union programs. I thought that Harry Fleischman's paper made it very clear that in some of the small-group programs he has run for union leadership, there has been some very sensitive discussion about civil liberties issues. But as he was the first to point out, the labor movement has not yet been able to develop large scale techniques or find the resources in personnel and funds to offer this education to the rank and file.

Mr. Thomas A. Van Sant: If there is a corporation point of view and a labor point of view, which point of view should we be presenting in the public schools? This is a question that we have tended to overlook.

If we abstract all the points of view, just what meat is left on the bone? How much vitality can come in a grain by grain abstraction of civil liberties so that you don't fall too much on one side or the other and be subject to accusations of bias? In adult education on a voluntary basis, to what extent can public schools abstract civic responsibility?

Mr. Harry Fleischman: One thing that is extremely important is that we've got to learn to live dangerously. We've got to learn to tread on toes. We have to be willing to stand up for our opinions.

In Scarsdale where there was an attack by the right wing group on the schools, the attack was beaten off and the "good guys" won, with what result? Next time they were extremely cautious about what books they were going to use. They didn't want any more trouble. This is what is really the danger--the fact that people are scared, cautious and don't want controversy.

Professor Alan F. Westin: The only way you can get this done in the schools is to create the kind of community force at the national level and at each local level so that you can say: the leaders in the community feel that the schools ought to do this. Without that kind of support, nothing that would be done in the Teachers College or university, by the Office of Education, nor would any curriculum guide have the slightest chance.

One thing I think all of us know--we're not talking about math and science. We can't say the equivalent of "these are the principles of math that all good men can agree upon." We are talking about social studies and value-charged areas in which many, many groups feel that they have a vested interest in keeping controversay and dissent out of the school system.

So we can't appeal to neutrality. The attempts being made by some curriculum reform projects to devise value-free ways of approaching the social studies are doomed to failure because they think they can abstract out the principles and eliminate controversy.

Dean Rupert Evans: I certainly agree that if you really want to get a research idea into effect on the Main Street communities of this country, you have to sell school boards and the people of the community that this is a worthwhile development.

> Dr. Alva R. Dittrick: If all of us concerned with civil liberties education can get behind the local school board, I think education can be changed. It is important for some of the leaders in corporations and unions to run for the school board, to make their voices heard. If we want to change the system, there had better be active involvement rather than just lip service and criticism of the way that schools are run now.

How Much Progress Since World War II?

Participants disagreed about the relative amount of "progress" there has been in American attitudes toward civil liberties since the end of the Second World War, and about the best attitude to take toward the system as it is now when one's goal is to improve on the present situation. They certainly agreed, however, that improvement is necessary:

> Mr. Paul Noble: This afternoon Harry Fleischman said that half of our high school students believe in wiretapping, 33% would deny freedom of speech, and so on, and mentioned that one-third of college-educated businessmen would ban a person from speaking who advocated government ownership of his industry.
>
> All of this implies that something fairly serious is wrong. But I'm wondering whether if we were to get this in terms of the stream of history, we might not find that actually we have made a great deal of progress in the last 20 years, indeed in the last 3 or 4 years.
>
> Mr. Arthur Reese: I don't subscribe to that approach because I've been hearing all along people saying, "What are you after?" Things are a lot better than they were a hundred years ago, fifty years ago. You ought to slow down. You're asking for too much. And if you put things in a historical perspective, we can just stop doing anything."
>
> Professor Christian Bay: I would answer that in terms of attitudes on domestic issues we are somewhat better off--but in terms of foreign policy we are worse off.
>
> Mr. Carl Schlesinger: I can't give a relative view from the entire U.S., but in New Jersey we had an entire governor's campaign where the central issue was whether a

> professor who made a pro-Viet Cong statement should be thrown out of the college. In the height of the Vietnam crisis, the voters overwhelmingly rejected the candidate who favored throwing the professor out, and this seems to me to indicate the sophistication of the voter.

New Civil Liberties Survey

There was strong support for the idea of a new survey to find out what the attitudes of young people, workers, and groups which are disadvantaged are toward civil liberties, after a decade of the civil rights revolution. Alan Westin explained that the Center will hold a planning conference in the fall of this year for a depth survey to explore current attitudes of young people toward civil liberties. Discussion of the survey produced several suggestions:

> **Professor Ivar E. Berg, Jr.:** I think we have to look at behavior as well as attitudes, or find a new way to measure attitudes. Since one of the things we know is that more people will make statements about believing in free speech or whatever, than will actually act on their belief.
>
> **Mr. Harry Fleischman:** Let's don't get bogged down in an expensive and overly complex survey. The informal questionnaire results we got in our civil liberties programs correlated very closely with what Sam Stouffer found. The important thing is to get some results that are current.
>
> **Professor Martin Rein:** I think that data from a new survey, whatever kind of survey it is, could be used very effectively as a strategic weapon to focus attention on the state of American civil liberties--to attrack interest on the national level, particularly the interest of the President, in the social conditions of the country, the social relationships and tolerance among people, just as there is now interest in the economic conditions of Americans.
>
> Perhaps the survey could be used to generate support for a Presidential conference on the state of American liberties.

Summary Comments and Recommendations

Participants from many areas expressed their conviction that the Center can make significant contributions to improve citizenship education in their particular areas. Many also expressed the idea that the Center was necessary to serve as a catalyst for bringing people together from different areas of professional and economic life who have a commitment to American liberties. The Center would thus create the kind of grass roots support which is necessary for a real change in the teaching of American liberties in the public schools and other educational forums of the country. They also offered suggestions for problems which the Center might investigate.

> **Mr. William Abbott:** I feel that in trying to help our young workers, we need the aid of the scholar, the knowledge of motivation of the social psychologists. I do feel that young workers are alienated, as Alan Westin described. There is apathy. There does not seem to be much motivation among many new workers.
>
> This is a challenge we are going to have to face up to because we do believe in democracy. I feel that sociology and psychology could help us very much, but I look in vain for any studies done on this number one problem of the trade union movement. Here we could have a unity between the scholarly community and the unions.

> **Mr. Harry Fleischman:** I hope that the Center, once it has developed some materials, will hold training institutes for labor people, or would prepare materials such that the unions could hold training institutes themselves.

> **Mr. Carl Schlesinger:** What the Center could do would be to prepare guide sheets and guide lines for Unions as to how to teach about liberty collectively and individually, as well as how to teach about collective and individual liberty.
>
> I think some attention should be paid to the "opinion-makers"--the mass media. I don't know what the long range effectiveness would be of teaching about civil liberties through the mass media, but perhaps the media could be used effectively to arouse public interest and concern about civil liberties, and lay a groundwork of acceptability

for the Center which would ease its efforts at public and parental education.

Mr. Arthur Reese: What you could do for the Freedom Schools would be to prepare basic materials which we can take and adapt to our own teaching. Don't worry about up-dating the cases--we can do that ourselves.

Mr. Thomas A. Van Sant: I'd like to urge that you not concentrate on the underprivileged, trying to develop in them some commitment to the system, a sense of their own worth, a hope of belonging, to the neglect of education for the middle class, advantaged kids. Because, for the immediate future, these middle class kids are the successors to those who now hold power, and it is they who will be in a position to do something about the existing inequities in the system.

Dr. Walter M. Arnold: It isn't only young workers, or new groups coming into the system who need help. There are approximately 23-25 million adults in this country with less than an 8th grade education. There are about 8 million adults classified as functionally illiterate.

What can we do for them? I think that the Center can work in the vocational education area, with us, to develop programs in these areas.

There's another new problem--earlier immigrants, along with their loyalty to this country and their hope, had better attitudes toward civil liberties, even if they never read the Constitution. They came away from a situation of oppression--they valued freedom, and their children learned those attitudes from them before ever starting school.

But today children seem to be learning anti-tolerance before they get to school--what can we do about that? How can we reach their parents? How can we reach very young children?

Professor Richard F. Whittemore: It appears to me that the scholar and the teacher as well as the civil rights leaders have parts to play in the education for American liberties among these dis-advantaged youth. How these special talents will be combined into a valuable approach is a central question that the Center must answer.

If we could find a way to combine Mr. Reese's techniques with experiences designed to cultivate logical and objective analysis, with respect to the kinds of cases that Professor Westin has spoken of, we might have a strategy appropriate to the ends we seek.

Dr. David Bushnell: I am very satisfied with the progress so far because emerging in my mind is a strategy for the Center that will lead to a curriculum development and the kind of participation on the whole community level we want.

In the process of civil liberties--and I think it is a process--the way to learn about it is to deal with that process. We can hope to bring these somewhat disparate groups together and arrive at areas of responsibility for implementing appropriate courses either for the young worker or the student in high school, or for the older worker, for that matter.

In my mind the strategy is beginning to take some shape--some pilot programs involving corporations, local groups, the Chamber of Commerce perhaps, labor unions, the civil rights leadership, and hopefully, then, the schools themselves will carry out a much more effective course in civil liberties.

Dr. Samuel D. Proctor: A man who sees this as a community in which opportunity continues to exist is going to see it as a community in which he as an individual has meaning and significance, in which he has worth.

I think we need the dimension which the Center is hoping to develop, the strategies and materials that allow the student to get beyond the generalized discussion of how great it is to be free and be able to speak one's mind, etc., perhaps through case studies.

In other words, if we create a situation in which the philosophy we profess is manifest--where opportunity does exist beyond the school situation--we also provide the materials for understanding in some substantial way the nature of the system which makes this possible and the validity of the system. Then we have the best of both worlds.

* * *

VI. Appendices

Appendix A. Agenda

CONFERENCE ON THE CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG WORKER

Held at Arden House, March 11, 12, 13, 1966

Sponsored by

The Center For Research and Education in American Liberties
Columbia University and Teachers College

Under a grant from the Division of Adult and Vocational Research,
U.S.O.E.

AGENDA

Friday

5:30 - 7 p.m. Cocktails

7:00 Dinner

8:30 General Session - Sun Room

Welcome: Minna Post Peyser, Associate Director of the Center

Address: "Politics, Citizenship Education and Liberty" Ralph W. Yarborough, U.S. Senator, Texas: Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Sub-Committee on Education, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

"Citizenship Education in a Changing Society" Alan F. Westin, Associate Professor of Public Law and Government: Director of the Center

Saturday

7:30 - 8:30 Breakfast

9:00 - 10:45 General Session - Sun Room

"Citizenship Education in the School Systems"

Chairman: Richard Nelson, Director of Public Relations, The Inland Steel Company

Member: Board of Governors, State Colleges and Universities of Illinois: Former member, State Board of Higher Education, Illinois: Board of Governors of the Center

Agenda (cont'd)

Paper: Richard F. W. Whittemore, Chairman of the Department of Social Studies, Teachers College: Board of Governors of the Center

Commentary by:

Walter M. Arnold, Assistant Commissioner for Vocational and Technical Education, U.S.O.E.

Jerry M. Rosenberg, Assistant Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

10:45 - 11:00 Coffee

11:00 - 12:45 General Session - Sun Room

"Citizenship and Public Affairs Education in Corporations"

Chairman: Clarence Walton, Dean of the Faculty of General Studies; formerly, Professor and Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Business. Member of the Board of Governors of the Center.

Paper: Thomas J. Diviney, Assistant Vice President Division of Public Affairs Research, National Industrial Conference Board.

Commentary by:

James J. Maher, Vice President in Charge of Public Affairs, The Chase Manhattan Bank.

Richard Armstrong, Executive Director, Effective Citizens Organizations, Inc.

Ivar E. Berg, Associate Professor of Business Administration, Columbia University: Member of the Board of Governors of the Center.

1:00 - 2:00 Lunch

2:30 - 4:15 General Session - Sun Room

"Citizenship and Public Affairs Education in Unions"

Chairman: Aaron W. Warner, Professor of Economics, Columbia University; member of the Board of Governors of the Center.

Agenda (cont'd)

Paper: Harry Fleischman, Director, National Labor Service, Institute of Human Relations.

Commentary by:

William Abbott, Education Director, United Rubber Workers of America.

Brendan Sexton, Director, Leadership Study Center, United Auto Workers*

Carl Schlesinger, Executive Secretary & Treasurer, Printing Utility Branch, N. Y. Typographical Union, Local #6.

Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., President, New York City Central Labor Council, and Business Manager, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local #3.

4:15 - 5:00 Coffee and Informal Discussion

6:30 - 8:00 Dinner

8:00 - 10:00 General Session - Sun Room

"Educating for American Liberties: The Psychological Issues"

Introduction: Alan F. Westin, Professor of Public Law and Government, Director of the Center.

Paper: Christian Bay, Lecturer in Political Science, Stanford University, author of *The Structure of Freedom*.

Commentary: Martin Deutsch, Director, Institute for Developmental Studies, N. Y. Medical College

Sunday

8:30 - 9:30 Breakfast

9:30 - 11:40 General Discussion Session - Sun Room

---

*Mr. Sexton, whose paper was among those distributed to participants prior to the conference, was unable to attend at the last minute due to illness.

Agenda (cont'd)

"Analyses and Recommendations to the Center"

Chairman: Alan F. Westin, Professor of Public Law and Government, Director of the Center.

12:00 Lunch

Adjourn

* * *

Appendix B. Supplemental Labor Education Report

Part I. Advanced Education Programs

Part II. Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in the Labor Press

By Judith Marine, Research Assistant
Center for Research and Education in American Liberties

Part I. Advanced Education Programs

The following examples of university and union education programs show the various types of labor education available to leaders and rank and file, in areas beyond the "core issues" of grievance handling, local union organization, collective bargaining, etc. In almost all cases, trade unionists who take these more general courses either will have previously completed basic leadership training programs, or will receive basic leadership training concurrently with the general courses. These are merely samples and are not intended as an exhaustive list. Some additional data on university labor education centers, compiled by the Labor Education and Research Service of Ohio State University, will be found in Appendix B.

Residential Institutes

1) An experimental program for educating union staff was conducted during the summers of 1961 and 1962 by the National Institute of Labor Education (NILE). The program was operated for 10 weeks each, on three campuses: Cornell University, Michigan State University and the University of California at Berkeley. In 1961 there were 45 students, in 1962, 25.

Each institute required full-time study in academic courses covering (1) trade union history and philosophy; (2) economics; (3) political science; (4) man and society (psychology and sociology). Each also offered a number of special sessions in which a visitor lectured and responded to discussion. (One lecture in this series was on Civil Liberties.) Additional features included courses designed to improve rapid reading, ability to write, individual research-and-writing projects, and a variety of excursions to points of special interest: factories, theatres, art galleries.

The program was held for full-time union staff, rather than local union officers as are most institutes, because NILE felt that full-time staff were likely to benefit more from such a program, as well as to be in a better position to apply what they learned to the formation of union policies.* It also would be difficult for officers to be released from their jobs for the 10-week period on employers' time, whereas unions willing to participate were expected to be willing to release staff on union time. Most participants were volunteers, and responded well to the programs. However, the schools were on the whole unsuccessful in arousing intellectual interest in the men who were assigned to attend by their unions but who were themselves indifferent toward education.

---

*Since many "staff"members are elected--as organizers, business agents, international representatives, etc.--they are also, of course, "union leaders."

In some of the courses, the case method was used. An evaluator of the institutes described the Cornell political science class as follows:

> The immediate focus of attention was on a series of selected United States Supreme Court decisions...which have played an historically crucial role in implementing and extending, defining and redefining such key provisions of the U.S. Constitution as the right of free speech and the right of assembly. In each instance the basic facts of the case were reviewed and both the majority and minority opinions...were discussed. The discussions were led and steered in a manner which aimed to pinpoint and clarify the fundamental constitutional issues involved.

Evaluators found that within two years after completing the courses, half the students were promoted to union positions involving greater responsibility. While a few students regarded the gain from their study as limited to personal growth, most of them have found ways to use their new knowledge in work for the union. Among the uses frequently mentioned in questionnaires were: (1) improved educational programs in the union; (2) increased political activity; (3) better economic arguments for use in collective bargaining; (4) changed attitude on foreign trade; (5) knowing where to get facts as needed; and (6) better ways of communicating with rank-and-file and getting members involved in union activities.

Also, while recognizing that attitudes in adults are not easily changed, the evaluators did test for possible changes, and found some change in the direction of: (1) less complacency about the history, present activities and future of the labor movement; (2) more concern for union democracy and participation by the rank and file; (3) more concern to reach the unorganized; (4) more acceptance of some modern economic viewpoints on public debt and on foreign trade; and (5) more concern for labor education.

One participant commented:

> Much of social science--not all of it--can have a value for union full-timers. The effort should be to get teachers who can select what is relevant and show how it is relevant. We are not looking for tool courses but for tool concepts--and for some basic information.

2) Southern Staff Training Institutes have been conducted by NILE since 1964. The program lasts for 4 weeks, and is held in cooperation with a university and the AFL-CIO. In 1965, the institute met in Austin, Texas, with the cooperation of the University of Texas. Eighteen full-time staff members from 14 international and national unions attended.

The purpose of these institutes, according to NILE, is "to use the instrumentalities of labor education as a vehicle to translate into action the stated views and public responsibilities of labor in the area of race relations..." The institutes are integrated, and sessions on the Civil Rights Acts, the "changing South," and labor and civil rights are intermixed with "basic leadership training."

3) The Florida AFL-CIO holds a one-week summer institute which includes application of Civil Rights Law applicable to unions and the community, and emphasis on participation in political activity, the importance of voter education, registration and methods of getting out the vote.

The schools are held at hotels, with staff from universities, the National AFL-CIO and state bodies. The schools are held in different geographical locations every year in order to attract new people. Average attendance is about 85.

4) In addition to a program of summer institutes for leadership training, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers are now setting up weekend "legislative institutes." Participants will be drawn from 12 or so locals in an area, with several people from each local for a total of 50 to 75. Each local is to select a "legislative chairman," and participants will be these chairmen, local officers, and rank and filers who are interested in legislative problems. The programs of the institutes will focus on (1) what legislation is before Congress and how it affects working people; and (2) how to influence Congress.

This is essentially the same approach as that used by the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education (COPE), and materials from COPE are used by many national and international unions in summer institutes or weekend programs on leadership training. The difference in the ACWA program is that the union chooses to emphasize political action by a special institute program in political skills, and that the ACWA's materials place more emphasis than do COPE's on working for the benefit of the working class as a whole, rather than primarily for organized labor, and on contact and communication with the rest of the community. The ACWA also intends that the effect of having one person in each local with the special responsibility of recruiting people for political activity will be to involve many more rank and filers than now participate.

5) Pennsylvania State University conducts a four-year program of one-week summer institutes for the Steelworkers. The second-year program's theme is "The Steelworker as Citizen," and covers courses in political science and economics, with emphasis on comparative government systems, practical politics, and the one-man, one-vote concept. The fourth-year program, "The Steelworker as a Person," contains discussions on the "whole man": the individual who is not only concerned with his own rights but also with the rights of his fellow men. During the institutes last summer, one afternoon workshop on civil rights was included.

Penn State, in connection with the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO, held a summer 1965 one-week institute on voter registration, elections and voter habits. It was attended by approximately 140 local and central body leaders. A mock two-party system, with independents, was set up at the beginning of the week. A non-labor issue was developed (so that none of the students would have to be "anti-labor"), with one party for, one against, and the independents neutral. The week was a combination of classroom instruction and mock voter registration, campaigning, election of party officers, and a referendum. The program ended with an analysis of voter habits and poll-taking influence.

6) The Communications Workers of America offer one-week resident schools which provide advanced training for local officers and leadership who have completed basic training courses held in their locals. The new curriculum for these schools is: First Year--labor history, economics of labor issues, politics and COPE, human relations, community services, and public relations; Second Year--leadership psychology, labor issues today, organizing, and practical politics.

Evening sessions in 1965 schools included a variety of topics, including "Labor and Public Education," "International Affairs," "State and City Labor Bodies," and the films "The Trial of Socrates" and "The Inheritance," the latter an Amalgamated Clothing Workers film which describes the struggle of the turn of the century immigrant groups to find freedom and dignity in the United States, their building of the industrial labor movement, and the modern struggle for civil rights.

The international's education department also supplies instructors' handbooks for locals, in areas such as leadership psychology, economics, community power structures, politics and COPE, and logic, as well as organizing and basic officer training. Most of the teaching of classes in locals so far, however, has been done by the international's education staff and university people.

Non-Residential Programs

1) A four-year curriculum is offered by the Union Leadership Academy (ULA), an association of the labor education services of Cornell University, Pennsylvania State University, Rutgers University, the University of Connecticut, and West Virginia University. The ULA was organized in 1957 in order to offer education to union leaders and members "beyond the traditional bread-and-butter courses on labor education." The ULA generally works with labor central bodies for recruitment purposes.

ULA Centers are located throughout the participating states--Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and West Virginia; for example, there are six such centers in West Virginia, seven in Pennsylvania. Classes are held once a week, for one or two hours, for varying numbers of weeks a year (See Appendix B).

The essential theme of the ULA curriculum is the labor movement as such, rather than any specific labor organization. The four-year program covers: (1) labor history; (2) labor and the economy; (3) labor and government; (4) labor and society--including study of power structures, mass psychology, social mobility & race relations; (5) psychology of union leadership; (6) union administration; (7) labor's current problems; and (8) labor's current goals. In studying labor's current problems and goals, comparisons are drawn between labor's aims and difficulties in the United States and those of labor in Europe.

In connection with the ULA program, the International Union of Electrical Workers has what it calls a "community steward" program. That is, the union encourages members who have had basic training in the ULA to study community structure, agencies available in the community and what they do, and how the community steward can be effective in community organization. Two IUE members in District 3, New Jersey, are currently* in a CAP training program, held at Rutgers, learning the skills of community organization. The IUE held its first annual "Civil Rights for All People Through Community Action" conference in February, 1966, and plans to encourage strongly the participation of its members in community organizations.

2) The Union Leadership Program of Ohio State University offers a program roughly like that of the ULA in 18 communities in Ohio. Their list of courses shows the slightly different emphasis they have: (1) economics; (2) sociology; (3) political science; (4) comparative political and economic systems; (5) collective bargaining; (6) union leadership: a case study in social psychology; (7) labor law: the law of collective bargaining; (8) complex organizations; and (9) labor history and contemporary problems. The courses are not given in the same order at the various centers. Ohio classes meet for two hours, one night each week for 24 weeks each year.

Ohio's program is staffed by faculty members from Ohio and other universities and colleges. Participants in the program are members of seventy-one different national and international unions. The following unions are the 11 with the largest number of participants, 1964-65:

United Automobile Workers	83
United Steelworkers of America	72
International Association of Machinists	27
AFSCME	22
Utility Workers Union of America	21
United Rubber Workers	20
IBEW	19
National Cash Register Independent Union	18
International Union of Operating Engineers	10
Allied Industrial Workers	9
National Association of Letter Carriers	9

---

*As of May, 1966.

Ohio State also conducts various conferences and short courses with unions and union locals. Short courses have, for example, included:

Youngstown AFL-CIO Short Course
Issues in an Election Year
October 1 - November 5, 1964
Attendance: 19

Coldwater Steelworkers Short Course
Issues of 1964
October 7-28, 1964
Attendance: 23
(Similar courses for Dayton & Cincinnati Steelworkers)

Portage County AFL-CIO Short Course
Public Speaking and Parliamentary Procedure
September 30 - October 14, 1965
Attendance: 30

Youngstown AFL-CIO Short Course
Public Speaking
October 19 - November 30, 1965
Attendance: 20

3) The University of Missouri offers short-term courses in public affairs, particular courses being chosen in response to requests from particular union locals. Staff includes faculty from the Missouri School of Business and Public Administration and outside specialists. Participants are union officers and rank and file workers both. Their short courses generally run 16 hours--2 hours a night, one night a week for 8 weeks.

In the fall, 1965, courses were offered in Current Economic and Political Problems and in Why Politics Is Important to You as a Union Member. The course in current problems included sessions on inflation, the Constitution and the Supreme Court Today, U.S. agricultural policies, the role of the government in the economy, tax cuts, and the Vietnam crisis.

4) The University of Colorado offers short-term courses of 8 sessions on the "Worker as Citizen" and "Understanding the Left, Right and Center," which have been given for union groups in various parts of the state.

5) The University of Illinois offers 8-week extension classes on "labor and politics," with "occasional sessions on the Bill of Rights, threats from the radical right, capitalism, socialism and communism, etc." Their classes are held throughout the state, and are attended mainly by local officers and shop stewards.

6) Roosevelt University offers a 4-year program, with each class meeting for 3 hours once a week for 32 weeks. Participants are union leaders from stewards to presidents. They "have programs at various times (within the four years) concerning civil liberties, extremist groups, etc., with lecturers from the American Civil Liberties Union or the American Jewish Committee."

7) Michigan-Wayne State University offers a liberal arts survey program at the "second level" of its education program. Faculty is from the

universities, and participants are union leaders. They "touch on citizen participation in public affairs as well as union affairs, and civil rights and civil liberties and the right of dissent are stressed."

8) Local 1199, Drug and Hospital Employees Union, RWDSU, in New York, has its own education program. In addition to a basic steward training course, Local 1199 offers an advanced 7-week course, 2 hours per week, for graduates of the basic course. Most of the students of these courses are Negro and Puerto Rican women who have had very little opportunity for formal education. The union has 300 graduates of the first year course, and 130 graduates of the advanced course. This second level class includes consumer problems, rent and housing, and political action, with a heavy emphasis on civil rights organizations and activity.

Local 1199 also has Friday night forums on topics of public interest--in 1965, poverty, civil rights, the current trade union movement, and peace. They also have a "social-cultural" program which includes Theater 1199, and special events such as their annual Salute to Freedom, a civil rights program.

Survey of Long-Term Programs--1965
(Prepared by the Labor Education and Research Service, Ohio State University)

University	No.of Subjects Required	Classroom-Hours		Years to Complete	Number Completing	Costs
		Total	Per Year			
U.C.L.A.	8 (of 16)	160	40	4	14 (est.)	Appl. $5. $20/crse $165/cert.
Cornell	7	75 (+4 days conf.)		1	10	$200
Indiana	6	225	75	3	1st yr: 27 2nd yr: 9	$32/crse $192/6 crse
Michigan-Wayne	6	160 (+4½ days conf.)	80	2	Starts Jan.'65 (52 enrolled)	$60/yr. $120/tot.
Minnesota	8	192	96	2	n.a.	$18/crse $154/tot.
Ohio State	9	144	48	3	1st yr.652 2nd yr.308 3rd yr.107 4th yr. 24*	$55/yr. $165/tot.
Penn State	8	128 (+1 day conf. ea. yr.)	32	4	1st yr.230 2nd yr. 95 3rd yr. 30 4th yr. 9	$15/crse $120/tot.
Roosevelt	7	96	96	4	96	$90.
Rutgers						
Four-year	8	144	36	4	12	$6/yr. $24/tot.
Certificate	4 req'd (30 ext. credits)	450		Variable	1 (24 enrolled)	$450.
Wisconsin	3	54	54	1	11	$2/crse $6/yr.
West Virginia	8	128	32	4	n.a.	$10/yr. $40/tot.

*Optional readings course.

Note: The figures for Ohio State are only for the last three years (1962-1963; 1963-1964; and 1964-65). The three previous years are not included as separate completion figures were not kept in those years. Total enrollments were 35 in 1959-60; 154 in 1960-1961; and 174 in 1961-1962.

Part II. Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in the Labor Press

Civil Rights

The following list includes all labor union publications indexed by the University of Michigan Index to Labor Union Periodicals, with the numbers of items indexed in 1964, 1965, and Jan-Feb 1966, under "Civil Rights," "Discrimination in Employment," "Labor Unions--minority groups," and "Minority Groups."

Name of Periodical	Items--1964	1965	Jan-Feb 1966
ABC News (Bakery & Confectionary workers)	2	1	
Advance (Clothing workers)	16	11	
AFL-CIO News*	92	65	4
Air Line Pilot			
American Federationist	10		
American Teacher	8	19	1
Bakers & Confectioners Journal (Ind.)		2	1
Butcher Workman	7	8**	
Building Tradesman	1	8	1
Canadian Labour	5	2	
Carpenter	2		
Catering Industry Employee	2	2	
CWA News (Communications workers)	4	2	
Dispatcher (Longshoremen & warehousemen-Ind.)	20	12	1
Electrical Workers Journal (IBEW)			
Ford Facts (UAW, Local 600)	12	7	
Free Labour World (ICFTU)			

---

* Published weekly, with many short items.

** One of these items attacked the civil rights groups picketing Mayor Daley.

Name of Periodical	Items-- 1964	1965	Jan-Feb 1966
The Government Standard (AFGE)	1	1	
Graphic Arts Unionist	1	1	
The Guild Reporter	18	10	
Hat Worker	2	8	
Insurance Worker	1		1
International Chemical Worker	4	5	
International Musician	1	1	
International Teamster		6	
I.U.D. Bulletin/Agenda (Industrial Union Dept.)	5	8	4
IUE News (Electrical workers)	20	11	
Justice (Ladies garment workers)	13	13	
Labor (RR Brotherhoods)	16	10	
Machinist	9	7	
Mine-Mill Union	9	10	1
Packinghouse Worker	8	15	
Pilot (NMU)	7	8	
Political Memo from COPE	5	11	
Public Employee (AFSCMN)	11	2	
Retail Clerks Advocate	2		
RWDSU Record (Retail, wholesale & department store workers)	22	9	1
Seafarers Log (SIU)	3	4	
Specialty Worker (Printing pressmen)		1	
Steel Labor	17	2	
Textile Labor			
TWU Express (Transport workers)	13	23	2
Typographical Union (ITU)			

THE LIBRARY OF
SEP 13 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION